# WATSON'S MAGAZINE

ol. XXII: No. 2. DECEMBER, 1915. Price, Ten Cents.

THOS. E. WATSON, EDITOR

ARTICLES BY THE EDITOR IN THIS NUMBER

WHEN DID ROMAN CATHOLICISM CEASE TO BE CHRISTIAN, AND BECOME A MONSTROSITY OF PAGANISM?

EDITORIAL NOTES AND CLIPPINGS

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
THOMSON, GEORGIA

# The Story of France

By THOS. E. WATSON

**TWO VOLUMES—$3.50**

**REVISED EDITION**

**CONTAINS:**

**THE ROMAN CONQUEST:** The Gauls, the Druids, the Minstrels, etc.

**THE FRANKISH CONQUEST:** Clovis, the Triumph of Christianity, Defeat of Saracens, etc.

**CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS TIMES.**

**THE DARK AGES:** Feudalism, Superstition, Papal Power and Tyranny, Religious Persecutions.

**THE INSTITUTION OF CHIVALRY.**

**THE CRUSADES.**

**THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.**

**JOAN OF ARC:** Her pure girlhood; heroic mission; saves France; burnt to death by priests of Rome; then canonized as a saint.

**THE ALBIGENSIAN CRUSADE:** The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

**THE OLD REGIME:** What it was in Church and State. The Rule of the Harlots, both in Church and State. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Dragonnades.

**THE REFORMATION.**

**COMPLETE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION:** Rise of Napoleon Bonaparte, and reorganization of both Church and State.

---

*In the preparation of this work, the author exhausted all the known sources of information, and no work on the subject has superseded his. It is standard, and will remain so.*

*Mr. Watson bought out his publishers, the MacMillans, and he now owns plates, copyright and all.*

**THE SOLE PUBLISHERS ARE:**

## The Jeffersonian Publishing Co.

July, 1914 **Thomson, - Georgia**

# Watson's Magazine

*Entered as second-class matter January 4, 1911, at the Post Office at Thomson, Georgia, Under the Act of March 3, 1879.*

*ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR* --- *TEN CENTS PER COPY*

*Vol. XXII.* *DECEMBER, 1915* *No. 2*

## CONTENTS

*FRONTISPIECE—"THE HOLIDAYS"* ..... *Eliza Cooke*

*SPECIAL ARTICLES AND EDITORIALS—Thos. E. Watson:*

*WHEN DID ROMAN CATHOLICISM CEASE TO BE CHRISTIAN, AND BECOME A MONSTROSITY OF PAGANISM?* ..... *59*

*THE STRANGE AND TRAGIC FATE OF MEXICO—Chapter VI* ..... *70*

*EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS* ..... *89*

*DANSANT—A Poem* ..... *Ralph M. Thomson* ..... *76*

*NATIONAL BANKS; WHY THEY SHOULD BE ABOLISHED* ..... *E. L. Dohoney* ..... *77*

*HON. S. S. PRENTISS* ..... *Jos. G. Baldwin* ..... *79*

*LETTERS FROM THE PLAIN, COMMON FOLKS* ..... *102*

*Published Monthly by THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, Thomson, Ga.*

# The Holidays

## Eliza Cooke

Once again, once again,
  Christmas wreathes are twining;
Once again, once again,
  Mistletoe is shining.

Time is marching through the land,
  Decked with leaf and berry;
He leads the Old Year by the hand,
  But both the churls are merry.

He speaketh in the clanging bells,
  He shouts at every portal:
God-speed the tidings that he tells—
  "Good-will and peace to mortal!"

Gladly welcome shall he be,
  Even though he traces
Silver threads upon our heads
  And wrinkles on our faces.

Spirits that have dwelt apart,
  Cold with pride and folly,
Bring olive in your hand and heart
  To weave with Christmas holly.

# Watson's Magazine

THOS. E. WATSON, Editor

## When Did Roman Catholicism Cease to be Christian, and Become a Monstrosity of Paganism?

THERE is no plea which the Romanists put forward oftener and with more persuasive unction, than that theirs is the Old Church.

"Come back to the old faith, return to the ancient fold, unite again with the Mother Church!" so runs the proselyting chant of Rome.

In Sir Walter Scott's novels, you realize his intense veneration for the venerable institution of popery, the majestic cathedral, the mysterious monastery; and you feel no great surprise when you learn that "Abbotsford," is now occupied by Catholics. If I am not mistaken, Byron was deeply imbued with the same reverence for the antique, and for the sensuous splendors of Roman ritualism. The tendency of Coleridge in the same direction is well known; and it would be idle to deny that the brilliant, superficial Macaulay was profoundly impressed by the subtile wisdom of the papal organization—an organization whose worldly adaptiveness, tenacity, artfulness, and unscrupulous methods had saved its life, when so many other dynasties had strewn their wreckage upon the shores of time.

"Come back to the Old Church!" is the insidious cry of Rome; and many there-by who are caught by it. The sly managers of "the Oxford movement" in England used that plea with ever increasing effect; and, strange to say, there wasn't a Protestant in the Kingdom who was sufficiently learned, or sufficiently courageous, to shatter Cardinal Newman's misstatements of ecclesiastical history. The novelist, Kingsley, tried his hand at it, and Newman laid him low. Kingsley was not in the same class with Newman as a scholar; and, whereas Kingsley was a novice at controversy, Newman was a past-master.

Dr. Wilberforce Farmer, the Methodist minister who went over to popery last year, claims to have been converted by Newman; and to have been particularly dazzled by the phrases of Cardinal Manning, that, "*If Christianity is historic, Catholicism is Christianity.*"

Perhaps, a man who is netted by a phrase like that, hardly repays the trouble of catching him, but it is fair to assume that Dr. Farmer's case is typical. Very few people do any real thinking; and very few, comparatively, are prepared by education or reading, to detect and expose the impudent falsehoods put forth by the Roman propagandists.

Bishop Warren Candler of Georgia was one of the teachers of Dr. Farmer; and it would seem that the Methodist prelate did not put the armor of defense upon his pupil. The young man went forth unarmed, with neither

sword nor buckler, and the well panoplied papists took him prisoner.

How many theological teachers of Protestantism are clothing their neophytes in the whole armor of the true Faith? How many Protestant preachers are intelligently safe-guarding their hearers against the wiles of Rome?

How many Protestant ministers know anything about it?

Very few. They have been dozing. They have been at ease in Zion. They have accustomed themselves to believe that Romanism, as described in "Fox's Book of Martyrs," was indeed a ravening beast, drunk on the blood of the Saints; but that the same beast would never again glut itself on human blood, even if it got the chance.

So, our Protestant ministers have wabbled along easily, knowing nothing of the Law of the Roman Church, and nothing of its real purpose. Instead of preaching against popery and all of its modern superstitions, they have even refused the use of their Protestant pulpits to evangels of Protestantism. Dogs in the manger, they will not do the necessary work themselves, nor permit others to do it.

Why not? Because, they say, it will hurt feelings, stir up strife, start a religious debate, dissatisfy the business men, agitate politicians, frighten the editors, and disrupt friendly relations, here, there and yonder.

The Gauls may march right along, and take the citadel: the geese will not give the alarm, this time. Even the geese used to have better sense than to let the citadel be captured by the invading enemy, without making an effort to hold it.

The Romanists say—contemptuously and tauntingly—that Protestant churches are dead. May-be so, but anti-Catholicism isn't dead: Americanism isn't dead: the spirit of Progress and Individualism is not dead: the undying determination of Humanity never again to be ruled by a preposterous Sham is not dead—nor will it ever die.

I propose to show, as briefly as possible, that so far from being the Old Church, the congeries of secret societies which collectively call themselves the Roman Catholic Church, is the most modern of all Christian sects, and has no claim whatever to be considered the Promitive Church of Christ.

Its present creed, in its distinctive features, was not known in the early centuries, was slowly built up during the Dark Ages; was not reduced to formula before the 16th century, and was not completed until 1870.

Think of the impudence of the Romanists in claiming antiquity for a church whose doctrines were not unified until the Council of Trent (1563), and whose latest dogma was added *five years after Lee's surrender at Appomattox!* (Meaning, of course, the monstrous doctrine of the pope's "infallibility.")

Think of their effrontery in calling the Roman Church the oldest, when its own history proves that John Cabot had discovered North America, and Columbus, South America, before the Council of Trent had added *twelve new articles to the Roman Catholic creed.*

In other words, the New World had been colonized and Luther's dynamic revolt started, before the Popes had fully developed their system into the Trentine formula; and even then the Catholic world had to wait 300 years for the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception and of the Pope's Infallibility. (Patience! Mary's mother will be decreed immaculate, next.)

What are the Roman Catholic beliefs which distinguish them from the oldest Christian Churches, namely, the Syrians, the Armenians, the Nestorians, the Greek Catholics and the Waldensians?

They are the Supremacy of the Pope, the Unmarried priesthood (Celibacy), the re-incarnation of Christ in the water and wine (Transubstantiation), Purgatory, Indulgences, Image worship, Miracle-making, deification

of Mary, prayers to "Saints," and Infallibility.

It may interest the reader to state that it was the Council of Trent which decreed that "all pastors who shall hereafter be placed over cathedrals and principal churches and their dependencies, or who, intrusted with the care of souls, are provided for, must be obliged to make public profession of the orthodox faith, *and to promise, AND SWEAR*, that they will continue obedient to the Church of Rome."

How amazing it is, to read the denials of priests, when it is alleged against them that they are compelled to take oaths of obedience to Rome!

The Council of Trent decreed that such oaths should be taken, and Pope Pius IV. issued his bull, accordingly, prescribing the form of the oath, which bull begins with the following words:

"The bull of Pius IV. by divine providence, Pope, relative to *THE FORM OF OATH* of the profession of faith."

In the preamble of his decree (bull) the Pope recites the action of the Council of Trent requiring the oath, and he includes in the form which is to be used the twelve new articles adopted by the Council. One of these (the 11th) compels an acknowledgement of the Roman church as *the mother and mistress of all other churches;* and exacts *strict obedience to the Pope*, as the Vicar of Christ.

The 12th of the new articles, embraced in the oath, required the priests to oppose all heresies whatever, and to anathematize everything the church anathematized.

*School-teachers, also, were required to sign oaths to teach and interpret, according to the Catholic faith.* (See Council of Trent. Session XXV., Cap. 2.)

The Nicene creed was framed by the Christian churches, in the year 325: and the Council itself was convened by the Emperor Constantine the Great, for the express purpose of harmonizing and completely setting forth the articles of the true Faith. His empire was being torn by the dissensions of sects, and he adopted this means of ending the strife.

As every one knows, the creed formulated by this first Council of Nice is the only one accepted throughout the Universal Church. In brief, it declares the Christian's belief in one God, and one Lord, the Son of God, who is of one substance with the Father; and who, for the salvation of men, came down from heaven, took our nature and became man: who suffered, rose again on the third day; ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost.

"Those who say there was a time when he (the Son) was not, or that he was created out of any other substance than the Father, let them be accursed." See Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, page 162, *note.*)

In one of the clauses (canons) of this Nicene creed, a curse is pronounced upon any man *who shall add any more articles of faith to those specified.*

Therefore, when the Council of Trent, 1238 years afterwards, added twelve new articles to the Christian creed, *it sacrilegiously apostatized from the true Faith.*

The orthodox doctrine proclaimed by the Emperor, after the Council at Nice had agreed on the words, is, that "Christ was incarnated by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man."

But the Council of Trent, defiining the nature of the Lord's Supper, declared "that Christ's *body and blood are* really, substantially, and *truly made*, by consercation, of the whole substance *of the bread*, and the whole substance *of the wine.*"

The original orthodox doctrine is that of a supernatural incarnation, an actual human Savior who takes man's nature and physical appearance, who actually and humanely suffers death on the Cross; and who, risen from the dead, is again God, and so ascends

into heaven, to await His second coming.

This doctrine staggers the human mind, and can only be understood by Faith; but it is not greatly different from the Buddhist system, or that of ancient Egypt; and it is a stupendous fact—disclosed by the temple ruins, the monumental relics, the ancient tombstones, the hieroglyphics on sphinx, and column, and cavern wall—that, for thousands of years before Christ, men had believed in the incarnation of deities in human forms.

To say and believe that the divine spirit took the form of a man, lived as a man, felt as a man, suffered as a man, and died as a man, is not incredible to those who believe in the immortality of the soul. If you and I have immortal spirits in us—spirits that can never die—we may be sure such a spirit did not have its origin in our mortality. In other words, the sexual act which produces a human being, could not possibly produce an eternal spirit.

In a sense, then, every immortal soul, is a part of the divine essence of things, and is itself an incarnation.

That which will live as long as God does, must have already lived as long as God has lived: if there is a soul within you that will never die, inexorable logic says that it was always existent, in some invisible, pre-natal form. A soul's life that will have no end, is one that has had no beginning. Like Jehovah, it was from everlasting to everlasting. To hold any other opinion about it, you will have to take the position that human copulation brings into existence, *eternal spirits.*

The Christ of the early church and the Nicene creed is understandable: the Christ of the Council of Trent cannot be understood. The Christ of the Nicene Council is the Redeemer who lives, moves, and has his being in the Gospels: the Christ of popery is a negation of the New Testament, a defiance of the Disciples, the Apostles, and the Fathers; a stultification of the Roman Church's own record and creed for more than 1,000 years; and the grossest possible insult to human reason.

According to the preposterous doctrine of Transubstantiation, Christ is constantly returning to the earth, whenever and wherever a priest recites a half-dozen Latin words over a piece of bread. Instead of waiting in heaven until the second coming, he is always coming, lying on ten thousand altars at the same instant, and being devoured by ten thousand congregations, *simultaneously.*

It wearies the patience of a rational man to even discuss such a proposition.

Is Christ *human*, when on the Catholic altar? Can a human being present himself in a thousand different places, at the same time? If Christ is not human again, after the priest consecrates the bread, how can it be claimed that the bread is substantially the body, the corporeal substance, the veritable flesh of Christ?

But if he is human, *is he dead?* Do the Catholics eat a human corpse? Or do they devour a live man? And if human, and alive, what it is that puts him to death again, in this "perpetual sacrifice of the mass?"

A sacrifice of man or beast necessarily implies, a live subject, a living victim, put to death in some way, for sacrificial purposes. The Gods were appeased by the offering of the sacrifice, at the pagan altar; but Christ came to stop all that, by offering himself up to die, once for all, to satisfy the debt of fallen humanity, to pay the debt of fallen humanity, to appease an offended God: he did it; and he cried on the Cross "*It is finished!*" *THE GREAT ATONEMENT WAS COMPLETE.*

For more than 1,000 years, the Roman Church held to that primitive, Gospel doctrine; and all the other Christian Churches, East and West, hold to it, yet. *Rome alone has changed.* Rome alone has gone away from the simple grandeur of one sublime sacrifice. The Syrians, the Nestorians, the Armenians, the Greek Catholics—all of them stand immovably

for the Old Faith of the Primitive Church. *It was Rome that*, in the year 1079, *went back to Paganism*, and to its innumerable altars, and its perpetual sacrifice.

So late as the year 1078, the Papal doctrine, announced by infallible Vicars of Christ, was the same as that of the modern Reformers: the very next year, the doctrine of Transublantiation was proclaimed. Thus Pope Gregory VII. was a Protestant, as to the Lord's Supper in 1078, and a Catholic, in 1079—being infallible both years.

It is curious to notice, in the Public Mass Book or Missal, the statement that, if the bread is not of *wheat*, "it doth not make a sacrifice." In Belgium, they use paste made of potatoes, and in this country, they use rice flake. According to the Catholic Missal, these do not "make a sacrament."

The Mass Book further directs the priest that, "if after consecration a gnat, or spider, or any such thing fall into the chalice, let the priest swallow it with the bread, if he can."

Poor "Father!" It must come hard, to have to gulp down a fly or a spider, when drinking his God.

Think of swallowing a gnat and God, at the same time!

But, if "Father" loathes the fly, or gnat, or spider so much that he cannot swallow it, what must he do?

"Let him take it out, and wash it with wine, and when mass is ended, burn it, and cast it and the washing into holy ground."

It must be a most blessed sight to see Father O'Toole fishing the dead fly out of the cup, washing the insect in wine, burning it, and then casting the wine and the remains of the burnt insect into holy ground. Not much is left of a gnat, after it has been burned.

The Mass Book further says—

"If any of the blood of Christ fall on the ground by negligence, *it must be licked up with the tongue*, the place be sufficiently scraped, and the scrapings burned; but the ashes must be buried in holy ground."

"If the priest *vomit the eucharist* (the consecrated wine), *he must piously swallow it again.*"

When the Old Testament means to allude to a particularly disgusting act, it mentions the dog that returns to his vomit. In the Roman Catholic service, that loathsome habit is made a religious duty. If the priest vomits the wine, he "must piously swallow it again."

But suppose he can't, then what?

"Then let the consecrated species be carefully separated (from the rest of the vomit) and put in some holy place, till they be corrupted, and, after, let them be cast into holy ground."

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

It is not necessary to again quote the numerous verses of the New Testament which so clearly show that there was absolute equality among the Disciples, that Christ refused to make any distinctions and censured those who proposed them, that Paul asserted himself to be quite the equal of the original Apostles; and that Peter never took a tone, or an attitude of primacy. Rather less self-conscious and aggressive than Paul, Peter fixed his own status in the last chapter of his Second Epistle, as that of an elder, equal to the other eiders, and especially disclaiming any right to superiority over the Civil authorities. (1 Peter 2, 13. 1 Peter 5, 1.)

Eusebius, the Father of Church history, shows how democratic the primitive churches were, and what an anomaly a Pope would have appeared. Mosheim, Newman, and scores of other students of this subject, have been forced to conclude that the Papacy was never in the minds of the early Fathers; and that it arose on the decay of Paganism, many centuries later, when the Emperors had abandoned Rome, and the Christian Bishop was the most powerful embodiment of local authority.

Let us begin with the Council of Nice, 325, summoned by Constantine, presided over by him, and confirmed

in its actions by him, with never a thought of referring any question to Rome, alone. That Council decreed—

"We ordain that the ancient customs be observed, which give power to the bishop of Alexandria, over the Provinces of Lybia, Egypt, Pentapolis, because the bishop of Rome hath like jurisdiction over his suburbicary regions."

This shows that the bishops, located in metropolitan cities, had acquired a jurisdiction over the churches of smaller towns within their geographical spheres. That is, the bishop of Alexandria was—by reason of his location, wealth, power, and perhaps superior learning and character—the superior of the more rural bishops; and the bishop of Rome enjoyed even greater advantages on account of his residence at the ancient seat of empire—Rome, so long the "Mistress of the World."

So matters remained until the year 451, when the General Council of Chalcedon was held, 630 bishops being present.

They decreed as follows:

"Whereas the old see of Rome hath not been undeservedly distinguished by the fathers with some privileges, *because that great city was the seat of empire;* the fathers of Constantinople were prompted *by the same motives*, to distinguish the new city of Rome (Constantinople) *with equal privileges;* thinking it fit that the city which they saw honoured with the empire and the Senate, and equalled in every Civil and religious privilege with old Rome, should likewise be *equalled in ecclesiastical matters.*"

Thus, 451 years after Peter's alleged establishment of the Papacy at Rome, the 630 Christian bishops have not heard of it; and they specifically declare that the privileges Rome had enjoyed, had been conceded her, not because of Peter or Paul, but because of her having been the old seat of empire. Moreover, these 630 bishops officially decree, in General Council, that the church at the new Capital, Constantinople, shall have the same equality with the old capital, Rome, in religious affairs, as it enjoyed in Civil affairs.

I don't see how any amount of Jesuit casuistry can avoid the conclusion which must follow these facts. The inspired authors of the Gospels did not know that Peter had been to Rome and established a Pontificate: the Acts of the Apostles fail to mention the prodigy, although the illness of Peter's wife's mother wins immortal mention: Peter himself was blissfully ignorant of his trip to Rome and his 23 years of Popehood: the Fathers of the Church wrote much, and they never referred to Peter's universal over-lordship, nor to his much worn "rock:" the Emperor Constantine was Pontifex Maximus of the Pagan religion, and was not aware that he had at Rome, a dangerous rival, wearing the same title: and, the 630 bishops, coming from all parts of the Roman empire did not know that, at Rome, they had a sovereign Pontiff, Lord of Lords, Ruler of Rulers, Vicar of Christ, tearer down and builder up of thrones, spiritual and temporal—an infallible Pontiff, whose foot princes must kiss, whose word was Law to Church and State: and whose power to bless or to curse, opened or closed the doors of Heaven and Hell.

### UNMARRIED PRIESTS: CELIBACY.

"*The doctrine of devils*," is the opprobrius phrase applied by the Apostle Paul *to celibacy*. (See Timothy, IV. 1, 2, 3.)

"*Forbidding to marry*," is one of the heresies and apostacies which the Apostle predicts will arise, "in the latter times" when "some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and the doctrines of devils."

Christ chose married men for his disciples, excepting John, his kinsman.

Paul distinctly claims for himself the same right as the other apostles to take a wife with him on his journeys, she being a sister in the faith. (See 1, Corinthians IX. 5.)

The Apostle also teaches, with the utmost directness that a bishop *must be* the husband of one wife; must be given to hospitality; must keep his children in subjection, "for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the house of God?"

"House" as here used, means household, or family, of course; and Paul certainly did not have in mind the unmarried priest, living with his buxom "housekeeper."

Deacons also must be married, "ruling their children," &c. (See 1 Tim. III. 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12.)

The whole Bible, the Old Testament and the New, is so impregnated with the Law of Nature, encouraging and even commanding men to marry and continue the human race, that the Popes, with all their arrogant powers, would never have succeeded with the devilish doctrine of "Forbidding to marry," had not the Roman Church forbade the lay Catholics to read the Book. The reading of the Scriptures was always enjoined as a duty, and never made a capital crime, until after the Popes brought, from the weak Emperor of the East-Roman world, the privilege to set themselves up as Universal Bishops.

At every step they took away from Primitive Christianity, it became more and more necessary to make the Bible a sealed book. For ages, the people were not allowed to know what the Scriptures taught. Even in the churches, the Bible was chained to the altar; and the layman could not read it, except under the eye of the priest. Consequently, the masses became wholly ignorant of Holy Writ. Whatever the priest chose to say was Gospel, had to be accepted. Doubt, meant heresy, and heresy meant death. Kings themselves were forced, in their coronation oaths, to swear to root out such heretics.

In the histories used in the schools, when we men of nearly three-score were at school, a glowing story was given of Henry V. King of England, who was the Prince Hal of Shakespeare, the victor of Agincourt and the conqueror of France. Of course, the book did not tell us that the hero-king, at the instance of Rome, made a law punishing with death any Englishman who read the Bible in English. This was aimed at Wyckliffe's translatiton, the only one the common people could read. The others were in Latin, or Greek, and the few copies in England were chained up in the churches, or in the colleges, as though they had been so many mad-dogs.

Have you ever thought of the Reformation, as being the logical and necessary result of Bible-reading? That's all it was. The Book had been concealed from the people, and the people could not know how great had been the apostacy, the falling away, of the Roman Catholic Church. As soon as Wyckliffe and Tyndale put the New Testament into English, "heresy" was rampant in England, and had to be suppressed barbarously by the Lancastrian Kings. As soon as Luther put the Bible in German, so the people could read it, half of Europe slabbed off from Popery; and the other half was saved to Rome by the most destructive wars, waged for no other purpose than to perpetuate the hateful tyrrany of hereditary Kings and Italian Popes.

Baited by the anti-Catholic press, the Romanists may now again permit the Catholic layman to read the Bible for himself, in his own home: when the layman does this, he will cease to be *a papist*, although he may continue to be a Catholic.

One of the first features of the papal system which will excite his opposition, because of its unnaturalness, its un-Scriptural character, and its inevitable immorality, is Celibacy, the "forbidding to marry."

Would that every Catholic could read the "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," by Henry C. Lea, LL.D., published in London, 1907. It is a masterly, up-to-date work.

Dr. Lea shows that celibacy was an accompaniment to fanatical asceticism, and was at first confined to the ascetics. All religions have their fanatics. The

Holy Rollers of this year, 1915, have, in the State of Alabama, attempted to handle serpents, with disastrous results to themselves. Brutally disregarding that spurious verse in the last chapter of Mark's Gospel, the Alabama moccasin bit the Holy Holler, and the last heard of the deluded woman, she was suffering the agonies which precede death.

The Hindoo fanatic will sit in the same spot, under a tree, for years and years, growing very thin, very filthy, and very holy. Another will hold his arm, stretched upward, day and night, month after month, year after year, until the limb is withered, dry and useless.

The Christian fanatics, of the early days, lived like wild beasts in caves; one would be a St. Anthony, who could not bear the sight of a woman; while another would be a St. Simeon Stylites, spending his life on the top of a lonely pillar in the desert.

To those times, and to that state of mind, belonged the Christian who thought it a sin to enjoy any object of nature; find pleasure in music, flowers, birds, and pet animals, or cultivate the mind amid the treasures of classic literature; or to find in the cheer of the hearth, the endearments of a wife and child, that which might disturb his intensely morbid and selfish meditations concerning the salvation of what he was pleased to call his "soul."

It was just that kind of morbid monster, and just that state of mind, which caused the indiscriminate destruction of classic libraries throughout Catholic Europe.

According to the Roman Catholic historian, Thuanus, the first who opposed the marriage of the clergy, was the Roman bishop (or pope) Calixtus, in the year 220. He was answered by Maximilian II., that the priests of the old law, and most of the apostles were married; and it is well known that Paphnutius, himself an unmarried ascetic, so powerfully opposed enforced celibacy, at the Council of Nice, the church refused to adopt a decree forbidding marriage to the clergy.

The 5th Apostolical Canon declares "A bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, must not put away his wife."

Ignatius, one of the Fathers, says that all the Apostles, except John, were married men; and Paul says that the brothers of Christ had wives.

Clemens Alexandrinus says—"That the apostles carried their wives about with them, to minister to those who were mistresses of families, that so the doctrine of the Lord might, without evil suspicion, enter the apartments of women."

That sounds most credible. Eastern women lived in secluded apartments to which men were not admitted to visit. No such objection could be made to women visitors; and therefore the apostles acted with practical wisdom in using their wives to penetrate these rooms, closed to themselves.

Describing the ideal Christian, Clemens says—"He eats, and drinks, *and marries, having the apostles as examples.*"

Nicholas Cusanus writes, "Till the time of Bishop (or pope) Cyricious, in 385, it was awful for all priests to marry, no law, no vow, no other restraint being to the contrary."

The Council of Ancyra, 315, had formally decreed, that "All deacons who are established in their charges, if they declare they have need to marry, *let them, after they are married*, remain in their ministry."

Polydore Virgil, a Catholic authority, says, "That the marriage of the clergy could not be prevented till Pope Gregory VII., in 1074, determined it; in which, however, he was resisted *as introducing a custom never received.*"

The bishops of France, Germany, and Italy, having wives, met together, and decreeing that Gregory had acted against Christian piety, deposed him.

Bellarmine, the standard Catholic authority, admits that the Catholic priests of the Greek churches were allowed to keep their wives. After the great split between the Eastern and Western Catholics, the Greek priests continued to marry. In fact, the Greek Catholic pastor *is required*

*to marry.* Only the shut-in monk is without a wife.

Turning now to Dr. Lea, page 182, Vol. I., we find this summing up:

"Such, at the opening of the 11th century, was the condition of the Church as regarded ascetic celibacy. * * * Legitimate marriage or promiscuous profligacy was almost universal (among the priests), in some places unconcealed, in others covered with a thin veil of hypocrisy. * * * So far, therefore, Latin Christianity had gained but little *in its struggle* of six centuries *with human nature.*"

Greek Christianity never waged such a struggle with human nature, hence the Eastern and Russian churches have never shocked the world with the horrors uncovered in Roman Catholic convents, monasteries, and papal palaces. Because the clergy of the Greek Catholic Church are compelled to marry, no Greek Catholic prelate has felt constrained to write such a horrible sentence as this of Cardinal Campeggio: "For priests to become husbands, is by far a more grievous sin than if they should keep many prostitutes in their houses." (Card. Camp. op Sleid. Com. 1.4.)

Another high Romanist authority wrote—

"A man who, after vowing Continency, doth marry, offends more than he who through human frailty goes astray with a hundred different women." (Mathias Aguensis, works.)

The Roman church having declared war against human nature, it is not to be wondered at that the humblest parish priest, the haughtiest Cardinal, and the most powerful Popes all fell into the same pollution.

Pope John XII. was killed in the act of adultery, by the woman's husband; and it was the papal palace which staged the tragedy .

Baronius, a Catholic writer, says, "That for 150 years together St. Peter's chair was filled, not with apostles, but apostates, put in fraudulently by vile prostitutes, namely, Marozia Theodora," &c.

One of these harlot-made popes *was a boy ten years old*, who is known to history as Pope Benedict IX.

Clement V. was described by a papal writer, as "a public debauchee."

Honorius of Autun writes that "Princes, monks, priests, nuns, and nunneries, and all orders of men have been defiled."

Alvarez Pelazius sets forth that "the cloisters are places of prostitution," and he says that "the sin of Sodom reigned the most august and venerable churches."

Speaking in the Council of Trent, the Bishop of Bitano declared "There is no filthiness, how monstrous soever, no villainy, no impurity, with which the people and clergy were not defiled."

In every Roman Catholic country, the record is the same. Denied the natural mating with the opposite sex in the bonds of wedlock, the priests either ignored the law of the church and married, or he lived openly with one or more concubines. He not only begot children, but loved them, was proud of them, publicly acknowledged them, and often introduced them into the clerical order, enriching them on the spoils of the church. (See "History Celibacy," I. 379. et seq.)

So late as the year 1250, marriage was common among the Irish priests. "Pope Innocent IV. ordered the Bishop of Ossory to deprive all married clerks of their benefices, and to remove all priests who had succeeded *to their fathers' parishes* without an intermediate incumbent."

The evil sought to be remedied was, that the priests had been ordaining their own sons as their immediate successors to the pastorates.

(It is well known that St. Patrick himself was the son of a priest, and so was his father.)

The effort of Pope Innocent IV. came to nothing: the Irish priests continued to take wives; and shortly before the Reformation (16th century), "it was not an usual thing for Irish priests to be openly married." ("Hist. Cel.," Vol. I., p. 365, citing Bradshaw's Enniskellin.)

In Southern Italy, where the Greek and Roman churches were brought together, the Greek priests kept their wives; and in 1274, when it seemed certain the Eastern churches would recognize the supremacy of the Pope, Nicholas III. made no objection to the Greek Catholic system of married priests.

Just as Pope Pius IV was willing to allow England to repudiate Transubstantiation, if she would again bow to Rome, so his predecessor was ready to yield to the Greek Catholics on canon of celibacy. ("Hist. Cel.," I. 407 and authorities there cited.)

In short, the entire record of the unmarried priest, in his enforced struggle against his human nature, has verified the prediction of the famous St. Bernard, himself an ascetic reformer and the foremost churchman of his day. He said:

"Deprive the Church of honorable marriage, and you fill her with concubinage, incest, and all manner of nameless vice and uncleanness."

When a cultured gentleman, like Petrarch, in describing the papal conditions at Avignon, was forced to employ language which cannot be translated and published; and when a Pope was publicly convicted of incest, adultery and sodomy—crimes which he confessed—it would seem that the Church was wilfully blind and wilfully sinful, not to have acted upon the urgent advice of the Emperor Sigismond, and to have repealed the canon against the marriage of the priests.

Perhaps the most repulsive spectacle ever presented to modern times was that which was seen in the Vatican, at Rome, October 31, 1501—some years after Christopher Columbus stumbled against the West Indies, and started the Slave Trade in the New World. The disgusting scene was described by Bishop Burchard, master of ceremonies to Pope Alexander VI.

The Pope gave a great banquet in the Vatican, and among those present were his bastards, Cæsar and Lucrezia Borgia. The attendants at the tables were beautiful young women, clothed in the sweet simplicity of Mother Eve, less the fig-leaf. After the rich food and drink had created the glow for which they are prized, the guests were treated to an amorous contest in the courtyard—a sort of Tournament of Venus, in which the nude girls, and men almost equally so, mingled in sexual combat. The spectators were the Pope, his bastards, his cardinals, his high and holy officials of the palace, &c.

The prize of the Tournament was offered to the man who could ride the course the greatest number of times; and with the utmost interest and eagerness the Pope and his daughters followed the progress of the unusual combat. (See Burchard's Diary; III. 167.)

The Borgia Pope was he who caused Savonarola to be burned at the stake, for denouncing the depravities of the clergy and demanding a reformation of morals.

The dauntless Florentine monk had declared that nuns in the convents were worse than harlots—the priests being their partners in all manner of bestial vice.

Cardinal Peter d'Ailly said that he did not dare to describe the immorality of the nunneries. Another high Catholic authority, Gerson, declared that the nunneries were houses of prostitution. Long before Henry VIII. of England broke from Rome, a papal investigation had exposed the terrible vices and crimes of British convents and monasteries. In the reign of Henry's father, English gentlemen, Catholics, of course, had memorialized the King on the subject of the systematic seduction of wives and daughters by the clergy. ("Hist. Cel. I. 17.)

High ecclesiastics, realizing the hopelessness of the struggle against human nature, had proposed that a system of regulated concubines be adopted as a substitute for marriage and a corrective of indiscriminate immorality. (Hist. Cel. II. I.)

Still more appalling, was that papal scale of prices which fixed the sum at

which the priest could purchase papal permission to commit adultery, live in concubinage, and even to have incestuous relations with women of his own blood.

Perhaps the most damning book against Popery ever printed was that which the Popes themselves caused to be printed, "The Taxes of the Penitentiary."

Pope Benedict XII. was the first to issue it, so far as now known, in the year 1338.

This Vicar of Christ, this infallible Pope, decreed that a concubinary priest might buy pardon for past fornication, and permission to live with his concubine, *for the sum of 5 gros-tournois*, which, expressed in our own money, was about 20 cents, equivalent now to perhaps $2.00.

So, in this, as in all other matters, money had the magic powers to annul papal laws.

Money could buy forgiveness for rape and murder, seduction and incest; money could buy papal license for marriage, for concubinage, for violation of the nunneries, and for vices which decent language shrinks from describing. Let the bribe be sufficiently tempting, and the Pope would unfrock the Cardinal, and give him a dispensation to marry; just as the Pope, sufficiently paid, would annul lawful marriages of laymen and grant them "dispensations" to contract others.

"Dispensations!" The law of God—according to papal theology—could be waived, set aside, dispensed with, whenever it pleased the Pope to arrest the Code of Omnipotence!

Hundreds of years after Gerson, the devout Catholic, had advised that a system of concubinage be substituted for marriage, Pope Pius IX. adopted the suggestion. In 1864, he formally decreed, that priests and nuns, of several years' standing and of approved loyalty to Rome, might live in concubinage, as a substitute for marriage; and the details, the *modus operandi*, of this cankerous system are set forth in Dr. Justin B. Fulton's dynamic book, "Why Priests Should Wed"—a book which was revised and approved by the late American Cato, Anthony Comstock.

Dr. Fulton's arraignment of the unmarried priesthood is terrific, because based upon hideous facts; but, after all, it simply echoes what Pope Gregory VII. said, what Petrarch said, what St. Bernard said, what so many Councils said, what Savonarola, Huss, Erasmus and Luther said; and what has been shown to be true, whenever the nunneries have been investigated.

# The Strange and Tragic Fate of Mexico

## CHAPTER VI

IN order to understand how Mexico at last revolted from Spain, and established her own independence, it is necessary to take a brief survey of European history during the latter part of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, during which era a new order was born—born of the horrible abuses of the Old Order and born amid tumults, riots, mob excesses, insurrections, revolution, and long wars.

Briefly, the *Ancien Regime*—Old Order—was the crystalized and fossilized despotism of the united spoilsmen, Church and State. The Pope and the King were twin-brothers in greed, immorality, goss disregard of duty, and a sordid tyrannical selfishness, which no cry of oppressed humanity could soften. The altar and the throne stood side by side, and upon these two sacrificial stones of Divine Right, men, women and children, in countless, unconsidered thousands perished, of hunger, of cold, of overwork, of preventable disease, and of ruthless persecution.

From the windows of his grandiose palace at Versailles, the Grand Monarch, Louis XIV might hear his starving subjects beg for bread, and shriek their desperate curses against the misgovernment of an absolute hereditary King; but, if the Bourbon grew uneasy in his conscience, and sought counsel of his Jesuit Confessor, that cynical and sinister soul-doctor bluntly informed his Majesty that all the property of all his subjects belonged to *him*, and that he might take as much of it by taxation as he saw fit to exact. (See St. Simon's Memoirs, Vol. 1.)

The great-grandson of Louis XIV, perpetuated the same crushing system, and was himself the most pious King that ever seduced four sisters, one after the other; flaunted an acknowledged mistress in the face of his wife; and kept a well supplied harem of young girls within the precincts of his palace-park; and this King, when hunting one day, chanced to pass a lonely little funeral group, with a rude box, on its way to the grave; and the King reined his horse to ask:

"*Of what did he die?*"

"*Of hunger, your majesty!*"

The King spurred his horse, and galloped on to the chase.

Some years later, a fanatic struck at this Bourbon monster with a knife, inflicting a slight wound. As he was seized and disarmed, the man exclaimed, "Sir, do something for the people, or there will be great troubles."

He was condemned to death, and the sentence was carried out with almost inconceivable barbarity. He was racked, he was tortured, molten lead was poured upon his wounds, four strong horses were hitched to his arms and legs, and then lashed fiercely, and driven in opposite directions to tear the limbs out of socket.

At the windows of the adjoining houses, and on the balconies, the high-born ladies of the Bourbon Court sat at ease, and taking refreshments as the terrible scene was prolonged. The screams of Damiens, the condemned, made no impression upon the elegant aristocrats who were looking on, but when the horses tugged and strained, unable to pull the man apart, and were lashed to further efforts, those courtly women loudly expressed their sympathies *for the horses.*

(For an attempt on Cardinal Antonelli's life—and he was not even wounded—Pope Pius IX, caused to be executed an Italian Catholic, whose supposed motive for the attack was, some one of the innumerable immoralities of the Cardinal.)

Louis XV died, a worn out debauchee, a life-long tool of priests and lewd women; a man wholly without morals, but so deeply imbued with

superstition that he feebly crawled out of his death-bed—all rotten with small-pox as he was—to kneel down in front of the little wheaten wafer which he hailed as "the Good God," because a priest had mumbled over it, the Latin words which mean,

*Bread thou art, but flesh thou shalt become.*

The news of the King's death caused rejoicing throughout France. Somehow, the idea got abroad that conditions would improve under the young Louis XVI.

It was an almost universal feeling, that the old system was doomed. Things could not go on as they were. A change was needed. Travellers, passing through France, had described the wretched condition of the peasantry. Books had been published attacking the Divine Right of hereditary Kings. Plays had been staged and acted, amid thunders of applause, in which the outrageous special privileges of the nobles were satyrized and held up to public hatred. Philosophers had toiled mightily, to unfetter the minds of Frenchmen, so long benumbed and sterilized by the clerical travesty of education. Statesmen had been loud in their prophetic warnings, and even the exhausted libertine on the throne had said:

"The system will last out my time, but after us, the Deluge."

Think of it! The peasantry did all the work, produced all the wealth, paid practically all the taxes, yet the peasant was not only refused permission to fence in his crop from the devastation of herds of deer, droves of hogs, and the inroads of cavalcades of mounted hunters, but he was not allowed to take for his own use on his own place, a hare, a quail, or a dove, and he was not at liberty to hoe or manure his crops, at certain seasons, lest the cutting of the weeds might disturb the young covies of quail, and the manure might injure their flavor!

The peasant was conscripted, to build the public roads: and he was called upon, a certain number of days each year, to do unpaid labor for his land-lord; and his land-lord required of him to fetch his wheat to the lord's mill, his grapes to the lord's wine-press; and out of everything produced on the peasant's farm, the lord and the priest took toll.

When the kingdom was at peace, the peasant fed it; when at war, the peasant bled for it. In time of peace—work he ever so hard—he could neither vote nor hold office. In time of war—fight he ever so hard—he could never rise out of the ranks.

There were no schools for his children, no hospitals for his sick, no golden door of opportunity inviting him to come up higher. Civilization passed him by, did not touch him with her magic wand, did not illumine his mind, his heart, his home. But if he failed to kneel, and take off his hat, when the priest went by with a Catholic idol, or a "consecrated" piece of bread, he was fiendishly tortured and then burnt at the stake.

Princes of State and Princes of Church rode in their grand coaches, drawn by four horses, enjoying the roads the forced peasant-labor had made, and if they deigned to look upon the peasant and his hovel at all, it was with a supercilious feeling of alienation, as though the peasant were a creature of a lower scale of animal life.

Princes of State and Princes of Church luxuriously dwelt in the most artistic palaces, set in glorious parks, and, with them, each day and each night was prized in proportion to its sensuous pleasures—lovely gardens, classic fountains, ornamental shrubbery, marble statuary, gorgeous flowers, voluptuous music, delicious banquets, and beautiful women.

To afford all this, they so framed "the law" that it robbed the peasant of everything except his black bread, made of the leavings of the grain. If the peasant had any friend in the Church, it was the parish priest, who lived with the people, witnessed their

struggles, saw their poverty, and shared it.

As to the Bishops, Archbishops and Cardinals, they were as haughty, as rapacious, and as profligate as the Princes of the State. All prelates being "gallant," it created no surprise when the Cardinal de Rohan intrigued to seduce Queen Marie Antoinette. Cardinal Richelieu had made love to Queen Anne, wife of Louis XIII, and Cardinal Mazarin had lived with her for many years before her death—the charitable supposed they had been privately married.

Upon this unnatural state of society, came the thunder-clap of the American war for independence.

France eagerly seized upon the opportunity to do England an evil turn, in retaliation for the losses England had inflicted upon France, in India, in Canada, and the North-western portion of Colonial America.

The French statesmen received American envoys, and began through underground channels to advance money to aid the Colonies. Young Frenchmen came over in shoals to enlist in the American army. To most of these, it was an adventure; to La Fayette and a few others, it was a principle. It was inevitable that when plain old rustily-dressed Ben Franklin became the fashion in Paris; and Voltaire returned to receive a spontaneous, enthusiastic ovation, and the handsome young John Laurens crossed the seas to kneel at the feet of King and Queen, asking for the aid of the French fleet—and additional cash; and the joint arms of America and France forced the sword out of England's hand at Yorktown; and all the gallant French officers came hurrying home, to fight their battles over again; it was inevitable, I say, that a new spirit should begin to brood upon the vast, dark waters of the unnatural Old Order.

Almost before anyone knew of the impending change, the change was manifest. The tone of conversation everywhere was different. In the salons of the aristocracy, people prattled about Liberty and the Rights of Man. The breath of the Encyclopedists, of Rousseau and Voltaire, of Thomas Paine and Condorcet and Diderot had not only ruffled the surface of the ocean of thought, but had disturbed the deeps. A vague aspiration for *the natural life*, was felt and displayed. The king put on a leather apron, and pottered about the forge, learning to make locks. The Queen created, in the Versailles Park, a rustic mill, farmhouse, and dairy; and this daughter of the Caesars played at being the farmer's wife, and sold milk to the nobility of France. Her brother, the Emperor of Austria, was a trenchant reformer, who compelled the Pope to eat humble pie and crouch at Canossa; but when he came on a visit to Paris, and listened to the democratic talk and witnessed the freakish rusticity of his sister, he shook his head and said, "*My* trade is, to be a King."

Madly extravagant herself, the giddy young Queen surrounded herself with insatiable sycophants who used their influence with her to empty the treasury of France.

A detailed account of these follies has been given in the 2nd volume of my "Story of France," and need not be repeated here. It is enough to say, that the time soon came when the squeezed orange—the peasantry—could be squeezed no further, and the royal Minister was confronted by an ever growing deficit. Bankruptcy threatened the monarchy.

The desperate Minister turned to the Nobles, and implored them to yield their exemption from the burdens of State. He was answered with an indignant, "No!"

The Minister pleaded with the clergy, beseeching them to waive their immunity from taxation. He was answered by a furious "No!"

In vain, the Minister endeavored to lop off useless and expensive offices, mere sinecures; the parasites made

common cause, the palace was in an uproar, and the weak King succumbed to environment.

Then what? The squeezed orange can yield no more; and even if loans could be again obtained, the usury would be so prohibitive that no relief could be expected.

Pamphlets fly in the air, the printing presses groaning day and night; and each succeeding pamphlet seems to be more violent than its predecessor. The Queen is assailed, the Austrian woman and her mad extravagance are the causes of bread famine.

Special Privilege is attacked, the Tax Farmers, the Monopolists are savagely denounced.

Bread grows scarcer, and prices soar; the laboring man cannot feed his children. Mobs collect, and raucous, seditious clamor is heard. Agitators run about the street scattering fire brands. All Paris is in ferment, and plainly, something must be done.

Can the soldiers quell the people? The attempt is made, but made irresolutely, and it ends in failure. More fiercely than ever, the insurrectionary pot boils; and, almost like spontaneous combustion, a great blaze leaps up, in the Palais Royal Gardens, and spreads, and spreads, and mounts higher and higher, until the Mob storms, and takes the Bastille, the hoary dungeon of many Bourbon Kings.

"Why, that's a revolt!" cried the King, when aroused from sleep by the Duke of Liancourt to hear the doomful tidings.

"No, Sir, it is a Revolution," gravely answered the Duke!

The fall of the Bastille was heard all round the world; and it was significant that one of the keys of the ancient Bourbon fortress should have been sent to George Washington. Royalist and Romanist writers tell you that few prisoners were found in the cells; what they do not tell you is, that the free-thinking and good-hearted Regent who governed France during the minority of Louis XV. had opened the doors, and offered freedom to all the captives. One of these had been confined for thirty-five years, and the most diligent inquiry failed to learn what the man had been imprisoned for, or by whom. Arriving from Italy, he had been clapped into the Bastille, and forgotten. Offered his liberty, the poor creature asked to be permitted to remain in jail. His life had been spent, his family scattered, his home lost—what could the old wreck do with his freedom?

Another thing the Royalists and the Romanists forget to tell you: at the spiteful institution of the King's scarlet woman, Madam de Pompadour, a harmless poet, Latude, was imprisoned for life, his crime being an epigram which stung royalty's harlot.

Such was *the system*: blazing with the splendors of unearned wealth at the top; smouldering with the intense dissatisfaction of the pillaged producers, at the bottom.

"*No, Sir! it is not a revolt—IT IS A REVOLUTION!*"

And, after all, what was it the People wanted? Was there method in their madness, or was there a blind Samson-like fury to pull down? Read their demands, and judge for yourself:

(1) "The sovereignty resides in the people, and should be exercised only by the nation's representatives, in accord with the King.

(2) We demand a constitution and laws, to be made and adopted by the States-General (the national Congress), who also should have the exclusive right to vote the taxes and control national expenditures.

(3) The agents of the executive power must be made responsible to the Congress of the nation.

(4) The privileges of the nobility and the clergy should be abolished.

(5) Serfdom should be abolished.

(6) All citizens should be eligible to public employments.

(8) The press should be free, and the sale of offices abolished, and justice be gratuitous.

(7) The press should be free, and each person left to practice what religion he pleases.

(9) Industry and commerce should be entirely free."

Do those demands go any further toward unbridled democracy, than do those of Magna Charta, the immortal document which still lies under the official curse of Papal Rome?

If Pope Innocent the Great excommunicated "the mob" of rebellious barons who forced the Great Charter from King John, and endeavored to wither the Charter itself with the anathema of God-on-earth, is it any wonder that Popes and tyrannical Kings beheld with wrath and horror the uprising of democracy in France?

Coming together in determined purpose, the Princes of the Church and of the State united to combat these revolutionary demands.

The *Canaille*, the rabble, the mob,—what business was it of theirs, how the nation was governed? Had not the Grand Monarch haughtily, and threateningly admonished the Parliament of Paris—"*The State?* That is *I!*"

And had not Parliament and People quailed under those Jovian looks, of Louis XIV.?

Yes; but times had changed. The American patriots had pulled down the leaden statues of King George III. and melted them into bullets to shoot at the royal troops. America, with French aid, had won; and, just as the principles of Montesqieu and Rousseau are to be recognized in the literature and laws of revolutionary America, the success of the Colonies came rebounding upon discontented France. Princes of the Church and of the State may fly across the Rhine, and organize armies to march into France, and stamp down the uprisen democracy. The Kings may confederate and Jesuits may plot, but at last the peasantry of France have aristocratic leaders—men who know how to lead, and it will be the Count of Mirabeau, or the Marquis La Fayette who place themselves at the head of the republican hosts. Stranger still, a Catholic bishop, Talleyrand, sees the trend of the times, and puts himself to work to confiscate the enormous, ill-gotten wealth of the Church.

Death-struggles came, as were inevitable: the New Order seeking to be born; and the Old Order fighting for life.

At last a day comes, when nothing but blood and iron will settle it; and Barbaroux and Danton and the Rolands call upon Marseilles, the hot-bed city of the South—

"Give us ten hundred men who know how to die, and the Revolution is accomplished."

Like the armed men where the dragon's teeth had been sown, they sprang up, the thousand men who knew how to die. They fall into ranks, they set their faces toward Paris, and they march, march, march, day after day, along the dusty roads, of the hot August of 1792, singing the Marseillaise.

How they were welcomed in Paris, all the world knows: what they did in Paris, history will forever tell. How many of them returned to the South, we do not know; but if you should travel to Lucerne, you will be shown the marble lion—recumbent, defeated, dying—which immortalizes the fidelity of the King's Swiss guards, who gave their lives in the vain effort to beat back the dauntless men of Marseilles—the ten hundred who sang the Marseillaise on the blazing highway, and led the furious attack upon the palace of the last hereditary Bourbon King.

Bad as conditions had been in France under the Old Order, they were even worse in some parts of Germany; and not much better in Spain, Italy and England. Privilege was everywhere enthroned, and the lot of the lower classes was fearfully hard. But the Princes of Church and State were implacably opposed to any reforms; and the consequence was, that England for many, many years was able, with her money, to form one Alliance after another against Revolutionary France.

To prevent the spread of "French principles" European dynasties, and hierarchies banded together; and the peasantry of Europe—worse oppressed than that of France—was drawn into vast armies, to make war upon the French, in order that the liberties of the French might not be extended to the lower classes throughout Europe. In other words, the oppressed of other nations had to fight, to keep their oppressors in power.

But the revolutionary armies were invincible. Inspired by the new birth of freedom, they fought with a spirit that nothing could daunt.

Then came Napoleon, a lieutenant of the old royal army, educated at the old royal military school, at the expense of the State. As long as he remained true to the principles of the Revolution, *which had made him*, he was irresistible. He scattered the armies of the Kings, like so much chaff.

But, at length, his character deteriorated. He sunk into sordid selfishness. The ambition to make himself another Charlemagne, to despotize over the whole of Europe, and to found a dynasty, was his ruin. He put away the childless wife of his young manhood: he took in her stead a stupid, immoral Austrian woman, dazzled by the idea that she was "the daughter of the Cæsars."

He re-established the Roman Catholic hierarchy: he crowned himself Emperor: he surrounded himself with courtiers, flatterers, sycophants: he lapped himself in luxury, and left his armies in Spain to lieutenants who were no match for Wellington: he developed the tyrant's disregard of the popular interest and dislike of the plain truth: he lost connection with the main body of his people, with the aspirations of oppressed nationalities, with the inexorable laws of commerce, depending altogether on his army and his own genius. Top-heavy, and with no real foundation save that of force, his Empire fell: and he ate his heart out, in a captivity due to nothing so much as his own falseness to the Revolutionary ideal—the true case of his meteoric career.

But a meteor like Napoleon could not shoot athwart the European skies without leaving a lasting impression. His work, in the main, had been magnificent and beneficent. He had built roads, bridges, canals: he had founded schools, literary, technological and scientific, as well as military. He had opened all careers to talent. He made an inn-keeper's son his brother-in-law, and a King. His generals, his marshals had sprung from the middle class: a village lawyer's boy rose, through the French army, to the throne of Sweden, where his descendants reign, today.

The Code of Napoleon set the example for other European codes; and he gave to degenerate, priest-ridden Spain a Constitution to which she owes her modern status—bad enough, but an immense improvement over the Spain of the old Bourbon Kings.

In 1821, Napoleon was dead at St. Helena, and the Old Order was stubbornly trying to come back, not only in France, but throughout the countries Napoleon had ruled. Foreign bayonets supported the Bourbon throne; the Holy Alliance of Kings cruelly reversed the lever of progress; a Catholic army from France restored the detestable Fardinand VII. of Spain: the democratic leaders were shot, or hanged: the peoples of Italy, Austria, Prussia, and the Rhine States were crushed—denied all the reforms which had been promised them, as the price of war against Napoleon. It was a frightful era of reaction, and the hopes of the friends of human progress sunk in despair. Metternichism was supreme; and it appeared probable that the hateful alliance between Pope and King might be more blighting than ever.

Elated and vainglorious, the Holy Alliance announced its purpose to invade the New World, and to reduce to submission the American Colonies which had taken advantage of the Napoleonic wars to throw off the yoke of Spain.

But here the Holy Alliance struck a snag—in fact, two snags, one English, and the other, North American.

England recognized the independence of the South American States, and our Government proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine.

"Hands off! Messieurs Kings! Stay on your own side of the ocean, and maintain your infernal system, if you can: but you shall not be allowed to bring it across."

Such, rapidly sketched, was the course of events which brought independence to Mexico, where the Spaniard of pure blood had had the unspeakable stupidity to outlaw *the creole.*

Of the beginnings of the wars of Independence, I will treat in the next chapter, but, in the meantime, reflect how one stone cast into the vast ocean of human affairs rippled the surface to the uttermost shores. The revolution in France, beginning with a book, a few pamphlets, some fiery speeches, a mob-attack on a prison, a march of one thousand volunteers—lawless and unprecedented—over-turns an ancient monarchy, shakes every throne, changes every Code, revolutionizes Mexico, and the Americas south of us, and lives today in the loftier aims of International Socialism.

Disraeli used to say that there were only two events of any importance in history; one, the Seige of Troy, and the other, the French Revolution.

I am unable to explain his allusion to the Seige of Troy; but he did not overestimate the profound, permanent, and most healthy influence of the Revolution—which lawlessly shattered a lawful, but most damnable system, built up by the greed, the cruelty, and the arrogance of *those united felons,* the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the hereditary, absolute Kings.

---

# Dansant

*Ralph M. Thomson*

A small, round table flushed with food—
A flaming drink or two;—
The red blood in a reckless mood—
The mind distracted through.

The strains of a seductive air—
The sex-call in a glance;—
An ardent, wine-awakened pair—
The sensual modern dance.

Another heart-degrading glass—
Discretion's funeral knell;—
A wild-eyed, passion-frenzied lass—
Flesh-close again—and—Hell!

# National Banks; Why They Should be Abolished.

E. L. Dohoney

THOSE were words of prophecy uttered by Mr. Pitt, the British statesman, at the time of the formation of the United States government, when he said: "The Americans have achieved their independence for little purpose, if they adopt the British banking system."

In the formation of our government, Jefferson was the leading representative of the people, and Hamilton of the monopolies. Washington was the balance of power. He promptly sided with Jefferson in favor of a republican form of government, but gave way to Hamilton on finance. The first national bank was chartered during Washington's administration; rechartered during Madison's administration; and, seeking a recharter during Jackson's administration, was defeated by that great man of the people. And here again come words of prophecy. It was Benton who said: "Jackson had not killed the bank tigress; that she was only wounded, and had retreated to the jungle, whence she would again return with her cubs." The opportune time came in the midst of the great civil war, when the life of the nation was in peril. Then it was that monopoly seized the nation by the throat; then it was that the bank brood marched out of the Tory jungle and planted themselves in the very citidel of American liberty. And today the liberty and the prosperity of the American people is dead! Over the tomb is erected not a single shaft, but over six thousand, and every one of them is a national bank.

A proper alignment of political parties in the United States would place the producing classes on one side, and monopoly in all its varied forms on the other. Plutocracy has entrenched itself behind the long lines and heavy walls of monopoly, and in the center stands the national bank system, resting on the prostrate form of labor, consuming the wealth of the latter as rapidly as it is produced; just as the fabled vulture came daily to eat out the vitals of chained Prometheus!

Let us briefly analyze this system of legalized robbery, and explain some of its rottenness.

Upon what are the national banks based? The answer is: United States bonds and other bonds. Upon what are these bonds resting that they should be considered a necessary basis for our monetary system? Simply on the credit of the nation, and the labor of this and succeeding generations. Exactly the same basis that irredeemable paper money stands on. If interest-bearing bonds are a safe basis for our financial system, as both democrats and republicans insist, the irredeemable paper money is better than bonds, because it rests on the same basis, with three conclusive advantages in its favor. First, it bears no interest. Second, it is a medium of exchange, which employs labor, stimulates trade and brings prosperity. Third, it never has to be redeemed or paid, as bonds must.

For forty years, I have been amazed and humiliated that the American people can not see so simple a thing, and that they do not rise in their sovereign majesty and wipe out this infernal system of banks and bonds, and establish a just monetary system.

Money is a creature of law, a representative of value, a medium of exchange, and a legal tender for debt, at whatever rate of usury the banks see proper to exact. I say 60 per cent. be-

cause I have known that rate charged by the banks.

Comptroller Williams in a late address at Frankfort, Ky., charges that in some localities in the South, the banks have exacted a much higher rate of usury than 60 per cent. I append hereto the following extract from the Comptroller's address.

Comtroller Williams is reported to have said:

"These banks are authorized by the government. To an extent at least, they have behind them the sanction, the prestige and the protection of the American nation—and they are lending $3.50 to a washerwoman, or to a laborer's or farmer's wife for six days at 2,400 per cent.

"When national banks chartered by the government disappoint and deprive toil of its just reward and stimulate resentment, we have prepared and fertilized the soil for a fearful crop of disaster.

"Below is the list of 1,020 national banks that by their own reports have made and are now making usury their regular business, that is, they are carrying on daylight robbery with the full knowledge of the government:

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | 6 |
| Illinois | 2 |
| Missouri | 2 |
| Georgia | 23 |
| Florida | 6 |
| Alabama | 21 |
| Louisiana | 2 |
| Texas | 315 |
| Arkansas | 17 |
| Tennessee | 3 |
| North Dakota | 90 |
| South Dakota | 25 |
| Nebraska | 18 |
| Kansas | 5 |
| Montana | 38 |
| Wyoming | 14 |
| Colorado | 37 |
| New Mexico | 25 |
| Oklahoma | 300 |
| Washington | 12 |
| Oregon | 10 |
| California | 13 |
| Utah | 2 |
| Nevada | 1 |
| Idaho | 33 |

"A glance at the report shows that Oklahoma and Texas are the paradise of usurers in America—and the hell of tenant farmers.

"In one southwestern state, according to Williams, 131 national banks report that they charged a maximum rate of interest of from 15 to 24 per cent; 67 banks, a maximum of between 25 and 60 per cent; 22 banks, a maximum of between 60 and 100 per cent; 18 banks between 100 and 200 per cent, and 8 banks between 200 and 2,000 per cent.

" 'Most of these disgraceful rates,' said the controller, 'were for comparatively small loans."

Why should not this infamous system of robbery be abolished? And all money, both coin and paper, be paid out on the debts and expenses of the United States, so as to go into circulation among the people without interest or usury charges.

Thomas Jefferson said "Treasury notes bottomed on taxes are good currency." And during the first two years of the Civil War, millions of dollars of treasury notes were issued and paid to soldiers for services, and to the farmers for supplies. Money was plentiful among the people: and everybody could get money for labor and for property; without going to banks to borrow and pay usury. The National Bank Law was not enacted until 1863, and during these two years before the banks were organized.—is the only time in the whole history of the United States that a sufficiency of money was ever in circulation, to produce general prosperity among the people. Of course this prosperity only existed inside the Union lines. But this historical fact is a conclusive refutation of the fraudulent fallacy that we need a system of robber banks, to put United States currency in circulation among the people.

Let us elect men to Congress who will return to the Democracy of Jefferson and Jackson: abolish National Banks: and restore the circulation of United States currency, to the people to whom it belongs.

# Hon. S. S. Prentiss.

Jos. G. Baldwin.

(From "Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi:")

THE character of the bar, in the older portions of the State of Mississippi, was very different from that of the bar in the new districts. Especially was this the case with the counties on and near the Mississippi river. In its front ranks stood Prentiss, Holt, Boyd, Quitman, Wilkinson, Winchester, Foote, Henderson, and others.

It was at the period first mentioned by me, in 1837, that Sargeant S. Prentiss was in the flower of his forensic fame. He had not, at that time, mingled largely in federal politics. He had made but few enemies; and had not "staled his presence," but was in all the freshness of his unmatched faculties. At this day it is difficult for anyone to appreciate the enthusiasm which greeted this gifted man, the admiration which was felt for him, and the affection which followed him. He was to Mississippi, in her youth, what Jenny Lind is to the musical world, or what Charles Fox, whom he resembled in many things, was to the whig party of England in his day. Why he was so, it is not difficult to see. He was a type of his times, a representative of the qualities of the people, or rather of the better qualities of the wilder and more impetuous part of them. The proportion of young men—as in all new countries—was great, and the proportion of wild young men was, unfortunately, still greater.

He had all those qualities which make us charitable to the character of Prince Hal, as it is painted by Shakespeare, even when our approval is not fully bestowed. Generous as a prince of royal blood, brave and chivalrous as a knight templar, of a spirit that scorned everything mean, underhanded or servile, he was prodigal to improvidence, instant in resentment, and bitter in his animosities, yet magnanimous to forgive when reparation had been made, or misconstruction explained away. There was no littleness about him. Even towards an avowed enemy he was open and manly, and bore himself with a sort of antique courtesy and knightly hostility, in which self-respect mingled with respect for his foe, except when contempt was mixed with hatred; then no words can convey any sense of the intensity of his scorn, the depth of his loathing. When he thus outlawed a man from his courtesy and respect, language could scarce supply words to express his disgust and detestation.

Fear seemed to be a stranger to his nature. He never hesitated to meet, nor did he wait for, "responsibility," but he went in quest of it. To denounce meanness or villainy, in any and all forms, when it came in his way, was, with him, a matter of duty, from which he never shrunk; and so to denounce it as to bring himself in direct collision with the perpetrator or perpetrators—for he took them in crowds as well as singly—was a task for which he was instant in season or out of season.

Even in the vices of Prentiss, there were magnificence and brilliancy imposing in a high degree. When he treated it was a mass entertainment. On one occasion he chartered the theatre for the special gratification of his friends,—the public generally. He bet thousands on the turn of a card, and witnessed the success or failure of the wager with the *nonchalance* of a Mexican monte-player, or, as was most usual, with the light humor of a Spanish muleteer. He broke a faro-bank by the nerve with which he laid his large bets, and by exciting the pas-

sion of the veteran dealer, or awed him into honesty by the glance of his strong and steady eye.

Attachment to his friends was a passion. It was a part of the loyalty to the honorable and chivalric, which formed the sub-soil of his strange and wayward nature. He never deserted a friend. His confidence knew no bounds. It scorned all restraints and considerations of prudence or policy. He made his friends' quarrels his own, and was as guardful of their reputations as of his own. He would put his name on the back of their paper, without looking at the face of it, and give his *carte blanche*, if needed, by the quire. He was above the littleness of jealousy or rivalry; and his love of truth, his fidelity and frankness, were formed on the antique models of the chevaliers. But in social qualities he knew no rival. These made him the delight of every circle; they were adapted to all, and were exercised on all. The same histrionic and dramatic talent that gave to his oratory so irresistible a charm, and adapted him to all grades and sorts of people, fitted him, in conversation, to delight all men. He never staled and never flagged. Even if the fund of acquired capital could have run out, his originality was such, that his supply from the perennial fountain within was inexhaustible.

His humor was as various as profound—from the most delicate wit to the broadest farce, from irony to caricature, from classical allusion to the verge—and sometimes beyond the verge—of coarse jest and Falstaff extravagance: and no one knew in which department he most excelled. His animal spirits flowed over like an artesian well, ever gushing out in a deep, brigat, and sparkling current.

He never seemed to despond or droop for a moment: the cares and anxieties of life were mere bagatelles to him. Sent to jail for fighting in the courthouse, he made the walls of the prison resound with unaccustomed shouts of merriment and revelry. Starting to fight a duel, he laid down his hand at poker, to resume it with a smile when he returned, and went on the field laughing with his friends, as to a pic-nic. Yet no one knew better the proprieties of life than himself—when to put off levity, and treat grave subjects and persons with proper respect: and no one could assume and preserve more gracefully a dignified and sober demeanor.

His early reading and education had been extensive and deep. Probably no man of his age, in the State, was so well read in the ancient and modern classics, in the current literature of the day, and—what may seem stranger—in the sacred scriptures. His speech drew some of their grandest images, strongest expressions, and aptest illustrations from the inspired writings.

The *personnel* of this remarkable man was well calculated to rivet the interest his character inspired. Though he was low of stature, and deformed in one leg, his frame was uncommonly athletic and muscular; his arms and chest were well formed, the latter deep and broad; his head large, and a model of classical proportions and noble contour. A handsome face, compact brow, massive and expanded, and eyes of dark hazel, full and clear, were fitted for the expression of every passion and flitting shade of feeling and sentiment. His complexion partook of the bilious rather than the sanguine temperament. The skin was smooth and bloodless—no excitement or stimulus heightened its color; nor did the writer ever see any evidence in his face of irregularity of habit. In repose, his countenance was serious and rather melancholy—certainly somewhat soft and quiet in expression, but evidencing strength and power, and the masculine rather than the light and flexible qualities which characterized him in his convivial moments. There was nothing affected or theatrical in his manner, though some parts of his printed speeches would seem to indicate this. He was frank and artless as a child; and nothing could have been more winning than his familiar intercourse with the

bar, with whom he was always a favorite, and without a rival in their affection.

I come now to speak of him as a lawyer.

He was more widely known as a politician than a lawyer, as an advocate than a jurist. This was because politics form a wider and more conspicuous theatre than the bar, and because the mass of men are better judges of oratory than of law. That he was a man of wonderful versatility and varied accomplishments, is most true; that he was a popular orator of the first class is also true; and that all of his faculties did not often, if ever, find employment in his profession, may be true likewise. So far he appeared to better advantage in a deliberative assembly, or before the people, because there he had a wider range and subjects of a more general interest, and was not fettered by rules and precedents; his genius expanded over a larger area, and exercised his powers in greater variety and number. Moreover, a stump speech is rarely made chiefly for conviction and persuasion, but to gratify and delight the auditors, and to raise the character of the speaker. Imagery, anecdote, ornament, eloquence and elocution, are in better taste than in a speech at the bar, where the chief and only legitimate aim is to convince and instruct.

It will always be a mooted point among Prentiss' admirers, as to where his strength chiefly lay. My own opinion is that it was as a jurist that he mostly excelled; that it consisted in *knowing and being able to show to others what was the law.* I state the opinion with some diffidence, and, did it rest on my own judgment alone, should not hazard it at all. But the eminent chief justice of the high court of errors and appeals of Mississippi thought that Prentiss appeared to most advantage before that court; and a distinguished judge of the Supreme Court of Alabama, who had heard him before the chancellor of Mississippi, expressed to me the opinion that his talents shone most conspicuously in that forum. These were men who could be led from a fair judgment of a legal argument by mere oratory, about as readily as old Playfair could be turned from a true criticism upon a mathematical treatise, by its being burnished over with extracts from Fourth-of-July harangues. Had brilliant declamation been his only or chief faculty, there were plenty of his competitorss at the bar, who, by their learning and powers of argument, would have knocked the spangles off him, and sent his cases whirling out of court, to the astonishment of hapless clients who had trusted to such fragile help in time of *trial.*

It may be asked how is this possible? How is it consistent with the jealous demands which the law makes of the ceaseless and persevering attention of her followers as the conditions of her favors? The question needs an answer. It is to be found somewhere else than in the unaided resources of even such an intellect as that of Sergeant Prentiss. In some form or other, Prentiss *always was* a student. Probably the most largely developed of all his faculties was his memory. He gathered information with marvellous rapidity. The sun-stroke that makes its impression upon the medicated plate is not more rapid in transcribing, or more faithful in fixing its image, than was his perception in taking cognizance of facts and principles, or his ability to retain them. Once fixed, the impression was there for ever. It is true, as Mr. Wirt observed, that genius must have materials to work on. No man how magnificently soever endowed, can possibly be safe, much less a great lawyer, who does not understand the facts and law of his case. But some men may understand them much more readily than others. There are labor-saving minds, as well as labor-saving machines, and that of Mr. Prentiss was one of them. In youth he nad devoted himself with intense application to legal studies, and had mastered, as few men have done, the elements of the law and much of its textbook learning. So acute and retentive an observer must too—especially in the freshness and

novelty of his first years of practice—"have absorbed" no little law as it floated through the courthouse, or was distilled from the bench and bar.

But more especially, it should be noted that Mr. Prentiss, until the fruition of his fame, was a laborious man, even in the tapestring sense. While the world was spreading the wild tales of his youth, his deviations, though conspicuous enough while they lasted, were only occasional, and at long intervals, the intervening time being occupied in abstemious application to his studies. Doubtless, too, the supposed obstacles in the way of his success were greatly exaggerated, the vulgar having a great proneness to magnify the frailties of great men, and to lionize genius by making it independent, for its splendid achievements, of all external aids.

With these allowances, however, truth requires the admission that Mr. Prentiss did, when at the seat of government, occupy the hours, usually allotted by the diligent practitioner to books or clients, in amusements not well suited to prepare him for those great efforts which have indissolubly associated his name with the judicial history of the State.

As an advocate, Mr. Prentiss attained a wider celebrity than as a jurist. Indeed, he was more formidable in this than in any other department of his profession. Before the Supreme, or Chancery, or Circuit Court, upon the law of the case, inferior abilities might set off, against greater native powers, superior application and research; or the precedents might overpower him; or the learning or judgment of the bench might come in aid of the right, even when more feebly defended than assailed. But what protection had mediocrity, or even second-rate talent, against the influences of excitement and fascination, let loose upon a mercurial jury, at least as easily impressed through their passions as their reason? The boldness of his attacks, his iron nerve, his adroitness, his power of debate, the overpowering fire—broadside after broadside—which he poured into the assailable points of his adversary, his facility and plainness of illustration, and his talent of adapting himself to every mind and character he addressed, rendered him, on all debatable issues, next to irresistible. To give him the conclusion was nearly the same thing as to give him the verdict.

In the examination of witnesses, he was thought particularly to excel. He wasted no time by irrelevant questions. He seemed to weigh every question before he put it, and see clearly its bearing upon every part of the case. The facts were brought out in natural and simple order. He examined as few witnesses, and elicited as few facts as he could safely get along with. In this way he avoided the danger of discrepancy, and kept his mind undiverted from the controlling points in the case. The jury were left unwearied and unconfused, and saw, before the argument, the bearing of the testimony.

He avoided, too, the miserable error into which so many lawyers fall, of making every possible point in a case, and pressing all with equal force and confidence, thereby prejudicing the mind of the court, and making the jury believe that the trial of a cause is but running a jockey race.

In arguing a cause of much public interest, he got all the benefit of the sympathy and feeling of the by-standers. He would sometimes turn towards them in an impassioned appeal, as if looking for a larger audience than the court and jury; and the excitement of the outsiders, especially in criminal cases, was thrown with great effect into the jury-box.

Mr. Prentiss was never thrown off his guard, or seemingly taken by surprise. He kept his temper; or, if he got furious, there was "method in his madness."

He had a faculty in speaking I never knew possessed by any other person. He seemed to speak without any effort of the will. There seemed to be no governing or guiding power to the particular faculty called into exercise. It worked on, and its treasures flowed spontaneously. There was no air of

thought, no elevation, frowning or knitting of the brow—no fixing up of the countenance—no pauses to collect or arrange his thoughts. All seemed natural and unpremeditated. No one ever felt uneasy lest he might fall; in his most brilliant flights "the empyrean heights" into which he soared seemed to be his natural element—as the upper air the eagle's.

Among the most powerful of his jury efforts, were his speeches against Bird, for the murder of Cameron; and against Phelps, the notorious highway robber and murderer. Both were convicted. The former owed his conviction, as General Foote, who defended him with great zeal and ability, thought, to the transcendent eloquence of Prentiss. He was justly convicted, however, as his confession, afterwards made, proved. Phelps was one of the most daring and desperate of ruffans. He fronted his prosecutor and the court, not only with composure, but with scornful and malignant defiance. When Prentiss rose to speak, and for some time afterwards, the criminal scowled upon him a look of hate and insolence. But when the orator, kindling with his subject, turned upon him, and poured down a stream of burning invective, like lava, upon his head; when he depicted the villainy and barbarity of his bloody atrocities; when he pictured, in dark and dismal colors, the fate which awaited him, and the awful judgment, to be pronounced at another bar, upon his crimes, when he should be confronted with his innocent victims: when he fixed his gaze of concentrated power upon him, the strong man's face relaxed; his eyes faltered and fell; until at length, unable to bear up longer, self-convicted, he hid his face beneath the bar, and exhibited a picture of ruffian-audacity cowed beneath the spell of true courage and triumphant genius. Though convicted, he was not hung. He broke jail, and resisted recapture so desperately, that although he was encumbered with his fetters, his pursuers had to kill him in self-defence, or permit his escape.

In his defence of criminals, in that large class of cases in which something of elevation or bravery in some sort, redeemed the lawlessness of the act, where murder was committed under a sense of outrage, or upon sudden resentment, and in fair combat, his chivalrous spirit upheld the public sentiment, which, if it did not justify that sort of "wild justice," could not be brought to punish it ignominously. His appeals fell like flames on those

"Souls made of fire, and children of the sun,
With whom revenge was virtue."

I have never heard of but one client of his who was convicted on a charge of homicide, and he was convicted of one of its lesser degrees. So successful was he, that the expression—"Prentiss couldn't clear him"—was a hyperbole that expressed the desperation of a criminal's fortunes.

Mr. Prentiss was employed only in important cases, and generally as associate counsel, and was thereby relieved of much of the preliminary preparation which occupies so much of the time of the attorney in getting a case ripe for trial. In the Supreme and Chancery Courts he had, of course, only to examine the record and prepare his argument. On the circuit his labors were much more arduous. The important criminal and civil causes which he argued, necessarily required proofs, either under his supervision, or by his advice and direction; and this, from the number and difficulty of the cases, must have consumed time and required application and industry.

At the time of which I speak, his long vigils and continued excitement did not enfeeble his energies. Indeed, he has been known to assert, that he felt brighter, and in better preparation for forensic debate, after sitting up all night in company with his friends than at any other time. He required less sleep, probably, than any man in the State, seldom devoting to that purpose more than three or four hours in the twenty-four. After his friends had retired at a late hour in the night, or rather at an early hour in the morning,

he has been known to get his books and papers and prepare for the business of the day.

His faculty of concentration drew his energies, as through a lens, upon the subject before him. No matter what he was engaged in, his intellect was in ceaseless play and motion. Alike comprehensive and systematic in the arrangement of his thoughts, he reproduced without difficulty what he had once conceived.

Probably something would have still been wanting to explain his celerity of preparation for his causes, had not partial nature gifted him with the lawyer's highest talent, the *acumen* which, like an instinct, enabled him to see the points which the record presented. His genius for generalizing saved him, in a moment, the labor of a long and tedious reflection upon, and collation of, the several parts of a narrative. He read with great rapidity; glancing his eyes through a page he caught the substance of its contents at a view. His analysis, too, was wonderful. The chemist does not reduce the contents of his alembic to their elements more rapidly or surely than he resolved the most complicated facts into primary principles.

His statements—like those of all great lawyers—were clear, perspicuous and compact; the language simple and sententious. Considered in the most technical sense, as forensic arguments merely, no one will deny that his speeches were admirable and able efforts. If the professional reader will turn to the meagre reports of his arguments in the cases of *Ross vs. Vertner*, How. 305; *Vick et al vs. The Mayor and Aldermen of Vicksburg*, 1 How. 381; and *The Planters' Bank vs. Snodgrass et al*, he will, I think, concur in this opinion.

Anecdotes are not wanting to show that even in the Supreme Courts he argued some cases of great importance, without knowing any thing about them till the argument was commenced. One of these savors of the ludicrous. Mr. Prentiss was retained, as associate counsel, with Mr. (now Gen.) M—at that time one of the most promising as now one of the most distinguished lawyers in the State. During the session of the Supreme Court, at which the case was to come on, Mr. M— called Mr. Prentiss' attention to the case, and proposed examining the record together; but for some reason this was deferred for some time. At last it was agreed to examine into the case the night before the day set for the hearing. At the appointed time, Prentiss could not be found. Mr. M— was in great perplexity. The case was of great importance; there were able opposing counsel, and his client and himself had trusted greatly to Mr. Prentiss' assistance. Prentiss appeared in the court-room when the case was called up. The junior counsel opened the case, reading slowly from the record all that was necessary to give a clear perception of its merits; and made the points, and read the authorities he had collected. The counsel on the other side replied. Mr. Prentiss rose to rejoin. The junior could scarcely conceal his apprehensions. But there was no cloud on the brow of the speaker; the consciousness of his power and of approaching victory sat on his face. He commenced, as he always did, by stating clearly the case, and the questions raised by the facts. He proceeded to establish the propositions he contended for, by their reason, by authorities, and collateral analogies, and to illustrate them from his copious resources of comparison. He took up, one by one, the arguments on the other side, and showed their fallacy; he examined the authorities relied upon in the order in which they were introduced, and showed their inapplicability, and the distinction between the facts of the cases reported and those in the case at bar; then returning to the authorities of his colleague, he showed how clearly, in application and principle, they supported his own argument. When he had sat down, his colleague declared that Prentiss had taught him more of the case than he had gathered from his own researches and reflection.

Mr. Prentiss had scarcely passed a decade from his majority when he was

the idol of Mississippi. While absent from the state his name was brought before the people for Congress; the State then voting by general ticket, and electing two members. He was elected, the sitting members declining to present themselves before the people, upon the claim, that they were elected at the special election, ordered by Governor Lynch, for two years, and not for the called session merely. Mr. Prentiss, with Mr. Word, his colleague went on to Washington to claim his seat. He was admitted to the bar of the House to defend and assert his right. He delivered then that speech which took the House and the country by storm; an effort which if his fame rested upon it alone, for its manliness of tone, exquisite satire, gorgeous imagery, and argumentive power, would have rendered his name imperishable. The House, opposed to him as it was in political sentiment, reversed its former judgment, which declared Gholson and Claiborne entitled to their seats, and divided equally on the question of admitting Prentiss and Word. The speaker, however, gave the casting vote against the latter, and the election was referred back to the people.

Mr. Prentiss addressed a circular to the voters of Mississippi, in which he announced his intention to canvass the State. The applause which greeted him at Washington, and which attended the speeches he was called on to make at the North, came thundering back to his adopted State. His friends —and their name was legion—thought before that his talents were of the higher order: and when their judgments were thus confirmed—when they received the indorsement of such men as Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, they felt a kind of personal interest in him: he was *their* Prentiss. They had first discovered him—first brought him out —first proclaimed his greatness. Their excitement knew no bounds. Political considerations, too, doubtless had their weight. The canvass opened—it was less a canvass than an ovation. He went through the State—an herculean task—making speeches every day, except Sundays, in the sultry months of summer and fall. The people of all classes and both sexes turned out to hear him. He came, as he declared, less on his own errand than theirs, to vindicate a violated constitution, to rebuke the insult to the honor and sovereignty of the State, to uphold the sacred right of the people to elect their own rulers. The theme was worthy of the orator, the orator of the subject.

This period may be considered the golden prime of the genius of Prentiss. His real effective greatness here attained its culminating point. He had the whole State for his audience, the honor of the State for his subject. He came well armed and well equipped for the warfare. Not content with challenging his competitors to the field, he threw down the gauntlet to all comers. Party, or ambition, or some other motive, constrained several gentlemen—famous before, notorious afterwards—to meet him. In every instance of such temerity, the opposer was made to bite the dust.

The ladies surrounded the rostrum with their carriages, and added, by their beauty, interest to the scene. There was no element of oratory that his genius did not supply. It was plain to see whence his boyhood had drawn its romantic inspiration. His imagination was colored and imbued with the light of the shadowy past, and was richly stored with the unreal but lifelike creations which the genius of Shakespeare and Scott had evoked from the ideal world. He had lingered, spell-bound, among the scenes of mediæval chivalry. His spirit had dwelt, until almost naturalized, in the mystic dream-land they peopled—among paladins, and crusaders, and knights-templars; with Monmouth and Percy—with Bois-Gilbert and Ivanhoe, and the bold McGregor—with the cavaliers of Rupert, and the iron enthusiasts of Fairfax. As Judge Bullard remarks of him, he had the talent of an Italian improvisatore, and could speak the thoughts of poetry with the inspiration of oratory, and in the tones of music. The fluency of his speech was

unbroken—no syllable unpronounced—not a ripple on the smooth and brilliant tide. Probably he never hesitated for a word in his life. His diction adapted itself, without effort, to the thought; now easy and familiar, now stately and dignified, now beautiful and various as the hues of the rainbow, again compact, even rugged in sinewy strength, or lofty and grand in eloquent declamation.

His face and manner were alike uncommon. The turn of the head was like Byron's; the face and the action were just what the mind made them. The excitement of the features, the motions of the head and body, the gesticulatian he used, were all in absolute harmony with the words you heard. You saw and took cognizance of the general effect only; the particular instrumentalities did not strike you; they certainly did not call off attention to themselves. How a countenance so redolent of good humor as his at times, could so soon be overcast, and express such intense bitterness, seemed a marvel. But bitterness and the argry passions were, probably, as strongly implanted in him as any other sentiments or qualities.

There was much about him to remind you of Byron: the cast of head—the classic features—the fiery and restive nature—the moral and personal daring—the imaginative and poetical temperament—the scorn and deep passion—the deformity of which I have spoken—the satiric wit—the craving for excitement, and the air of melancholy he sometimes wore—his early neglect, and the imagined slights put upon him in his unfriended youth—the collisions, mental and physical, which he had with others—his brilliant and sudden reputation, and the romantic interest which invested him, make up a list of correspondencies, still further increased, alas! by his untimely death.

With such abilities as we have alluded to, and surrounded by such circumstances, he prosecuted the canvas, making himself the equal favorite of all classes. Old democrats were seen, with tears rolling down their cheeks, laughing hysterically; and some, who, ever since the formation of parties, had voted the democratic ticket, from coroner up to governor, threw up their hats and shouted for him. He was returned to Congress by a large majority, leading his colleague, who ran on precisely the same question, more than a thousand votes.

The political career of Mr. Prentiss after this time is matter of public history, and I do not propose to refer to it.

After his return from Congress, Mr. Prentiss continued to devote himself to his profession; but, subsequently to 1841 or 1842, he was more engaged in closing up his old business than in prosecuting new. Some year or two afterwards, the suit which involved his fortune was determined against him in the Supreme Court of the United States; and he found himself by this event, aggravated as it was by his immense liabilities for others, deprived of the accumulations of years of successful practice, and again dependent upon his own exertions for the support of himself and others now placed under his protection. In the mean time, the profession in Mississippi had become less remunerative, and more laborious. Bearing up with an unbroken spirit against adverse fortune, he determined to try a new theatre, where his talents might have larger scope. For this purpose, he removed to the city of New Orleans, and was admitted to the bar there. How rapidly he rose to a position among the leaders of that eminent bar, and how near he seemed to be to its first honors, the country knows. The energy with which he addressed himself to the task of mastering the peculiar jurisprudence of Louisiana, and the success with which his efforts were crowned, are not the least of the splendid achievements of this distinguished gentleman.

The danger is not that we shall be misconstrued in regard to the rude sketch we have given of Mr. Prentiss in any such manner as to leave the impression that we are prejudiced against, or have underrated the character of,

that gentleman. We are conscious of having written in no unkind or unloving spirit of one whom, in life, we honored, and whose memory is still dear to us; the danger is elsewhere. It is two-fold: that we may be supposed to have assigned to Prentiss a higher order of abilities than he possessed; and, in the second place, that we have presented, for undistinguishing admiration, a character, some of the elements of which do not deserve to be admired or imitated—and indeed, which are of most perilous example, especially to warm-blooded youth. As to the first objection, we feel sure that we are not mistaken, and even did we distrust our own judgment we would be confirmed by Sharkey, Boyd, Wilkinson, Guion, Quitman, to say nothing of the commendations of Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, "the immortal three," whose opinions as to Prentiss' talents would be considered extravagant if they did not carry with them the *imprimatur* of their own great names. But we confess to the danger implied in the second suggestion. With all our admiration for Prentiss—much as his memory is endeared to us—however the faults of his character and the irregularities of his life may be palliated by the peculiar circumstances which pressed upon idiosyncracies of temper and mind almost as peculiar as those circumstances, —it cannot be denied, and it ought not to be concealed, that the influence of Prentiss upon the men, especially upon the young men of this time and association, was hurtful. True, he had some attributes worthy of unlimited admiration, and he did some things which the best men might take as examples for imitation. He was a noble, wholesouled, magnanimous man: as pure of honor, as lofty in chivalric bearing as the heroes of romance: but, mixed with these brilliant qualities, were vices of mind and habit, which those fascinating graces rendered doubly dangerous: for vice is more easily copied than virtue: and in the partnership between virtue and vice, vice subsidizes virtue to its uses. Prentiss lacked regular, self-denying, systematic application. He accomplished a great deal, but not a great deal for his capital: if he did more than most men, he did less than the task of such a man: if he gathered much, he wasted and scattered more. He wanted the most essential element of a true, genuine, moral greatness: there was not—above his intellect—above his bright array of strong powers and glittering faculties—above the fierce hosts of passion in his soul—a *presiding spirit of Duty*. Life was no trust to him: it was a thing to be enjoyed—a bright holiday season—a gala day, to be spent freely and carelessly—a gift to be decked out with brilliant deeds and eloquent words and all gewgaws of fancy—and to be laid down bravely when the evening star should succeed the bright sun, and the dews begin to fall softly upon the green earth. True, he labored more than most men: but he labored as he frolicked—because his mind could not be idle, but burst into work as by the irrepressible instinct which sought occupation as an outlet to intellectual excitement: but what he accomplished was nothing to the measure of his powers. He studied more than he seemed to study,—more, probably, than he cared to have it believed he studied. But he could accomplish with only slender effort, the end for which less gifted men must delve, and toil, and slave. But the imitators, the many youths of warm passions and high hopes, ambitious of distinction—yet solicitous of pleasure—blinded by the glare of Prentiss' eloquence, the corruscations of a wit and fancy through which his speeches were borne as a stately ship through the phosphorescent waves of a tropical sea—what example was it to *them* to see the renown of the Forum, the eloquence of the Hustings, the triumphs of the Senate associated with the faro-table, the midnight revel, the drunken carouse, the loose talk of the board laden with wine and cards? What Prentiss effected they failed in compassing. Like a chamois hunter full of life, and vigor, and courage, supported by the spear of his genius—potent as Ithuriel's—Prentiss sprang up the steeps and leaped over the chasms on his way to the mount where

the "proud temple" shines above cloud and storm; but mediocrity, in assaying to follow him, but made ridiculous the enterprise which only such a man with such aids could accomplish. And even he, not wisely or well: the penalty came at last, as it must ever come for a violation of natural and moral laws. He lived in pain and poverty, drooping in spirit, exhausted in mind and body, to lament that wasting of life, and health, and genius, which, unwasted, in the heydey of existence, and in the meridian lustre of his unrivalled powers, might have opened for himself and for his country a career of unselfishness and just renown scarcely paralleled by the most honored and loved of all the land.

If to squander thus such rare gifts were a grievous fault, grievously hath this erring child of genius answered it. But painfully making this we can say, that, with this deduction from Prentiss' claims to reverence and honor, there yet remains so much of force and of brilliancy in the character—so much that is honorable, and noble, and generous—so much of a manhood whose robust and masculine virtues are set off by the wild and lovely graces that attempered and adorned its strength, that we feel drawn to it not less to admire than to love.

In the midst of his budding prospects, rapidly ripening into fruition, insidious disease assailed him. It was long hoped that the close and fibrous system, which had, seemingly, defied all the laws of nature, would prove superior to this malady. His unconquerable will bore him up long against its attacks. Indeed it seemed that only death itself could subdue that fiery and unextinguishable energy. He made his last great effort, breathing in his feeble accents but a more touching and affecting pathos, and a more persuasive eloquence, in behalf of Lopez, charged with the offence of fitting out an expedition against Cuba. So weak was he, that he was compelled to deliver it in a sitting posture, and was carried, after its delivery, exhausted from the bar.

Not long after this time, in a state of complete prostration, he was taken, in a steamboat, from New Orleans to Natchez, under the care of some faithful friends. The opiates given him, and the exhaustion of nature, had dethroned his imperial reason; and the great advocate talked wildly of some trial in which he supposed he was engaged. When he reached Natchez, he was taken to the residence of a relation, and from that time, only for a moment, did a glance of recognition fall—lighting up for an instant his pallid features—upon his wife and children, weeping around his bed. This remarkable man died in the 42d year of his age. What he *was* we know. What he *might have been*, after a mature age and a riper wisdom, we cannot tell. But that he was capable of commanding the loftiest heights of fame, and marking his name and character upon the age he lived in, we verily believe.

But he has gone. He died, and lies buried near that noble river which first, when a raw Yankee boy, caught his poetic eye, and stirred, by its aspect of grandeur, his sublime imagination: upon whose shores first fell his burning and impassioned words as they aroused the rapturous applause of his astonished auditors. And long will that noble river flow out its tide into the gulf, ere the roar of its current shall mingle with the tones of such eloquence again—eloquence as full and majestic, as resistless and sublime, and as wild in its sweep as its own sea-like flood,

——"the mightiest river
Rolls mingling with his fame forever."

The tidings of his death came like wailing over the State, and we all heard them, as the toll of the bell for a brother's funeral. The chivalrous felt, when they heard that "young Harry Percy's spur was cold," that the world had somehow grown commonplace; and the men of wit and genius, or those who could appreciate such qualities in others, looking over the surviving bar, exclaimed with a sigh—

'The blaze of wit, the flash of bright intelligence,
The beam of social eloquence,
Sunk with his sun."

# Editorial Notes and Clippings.

IN our November issue, our readers had the opportunity to see how fervent is the zeal of Roman Catholic prelates for religious liberty, whenever and wherever *their* ox is being gored. Intolerance is a bull of frightful mien, *if* it happens to turn its horns against Popery.

There never was a more arrogant, insolent and treasonous tirade against the Chief Magistrate of a Government, than the outrageous editorial of Archbishop Blenk, published in his New Orleans organ, The Morning Star, on October 16, 1915.

Declaring that President Wilson must "*pay the penalty*", for "insulting" "the greatest religious body of this country," by recognizing General Carranza in Mexico, the seditious Blenk is adding fuel to flames that are already dangerously fierce.

This Government had no more right to impose terms upon Carranza, than it had to fetter the new Republic of Portugal, which overthrew the monarchy, drove out the Jesuits, the monks and their women, and which separated the State from the Roman Church. President Taft recognized the new order in Portugal, *as a political fact*. He could not enter into a discussion of Portugal's domestic affairs, and did not attempt it. Nor did Blenk, Gibbons, O'Connell, and all that papal pack, bark at his heels about it.

Why have they acted so differently in the case of Mexico? It is because the Roman Church furnished $11,000,000 to the revolt which destroyed the Constitutional government of our neighboring Republic, and because they are so deeply incensed and mortified at the failure of all their Jesuit plots to defeat Carranza, the Constitutionalist, and set up in his stead the bloody handed traitor and murderer, Huerta.

After the coward ran away from Mexico, without ever having dared to face the Constitutionalist leaders in battle, the Roman prelates brought him back to New York, as the central figure of the German-Catholic plot. If Germany and the Pope could have used old Huerta as a tool, to foment civil war in Mexico and to provoke American intervention, our Government would have had its hands so full of domestic troubles, that it would not have been able to take any action against the two German emperors, no matter how many aggressions they committed against American life and property.

The President nipped the plot in the bud by arresting Huerta, and holding him at El Paso. Hence, Messrs. Blenk, Gibbons, O'Connell, Keiley and the whole foot-kissing pack, are suffering the pangs of a bitter disappointment.

In their rage, they menace the President, and declare that *he must pay the penalty* of having *insulted* them.

What penalty?

If another Catholic fanatic should assassinate another President, *there will be a bad day for Catholic priests and for Jesuits*, in this country.

When the Pan-American diplomats —rank papists—endeavored to extract from General Carranza some special pledge in behalf of the Roman Church, he refused to give it. He said that Catholics should have religious liberty, and that all other sects should have it. He declared that he meant to impartially enforce the Constitution and laws of his country. Let us see, then, what are those laws which create such murderous fury in the hearts of the Blenks, the Keileys, the Gibbonses, and the O'Connells.

The Constitution of Mexico was made in 1857; among its provisions are these:

"This Constitution was adopted in 1857, but the people have been prevented from

having it put into force. It is for this Constitution that Villa is fighting:

Article I. The Mexican people recognize that the rights of men are the foundation and the purpose of social institutions. In consequence they proclaim that all the laws and authorities of the country must respect and sustain the warrantles stipulated by this Constitution.

Article II. In the republic every one is born free. The slaves who step into the national territory recover their liberty by this mere fact, and have the right of the protection of the law.

Articles III and IV. All education is free. The law will determine which profession needs a diplomat for its exercise, and what requisites are to be fulfilled.

Every man is free to adopt the profession, trade or work that suits him, it being useful and honest; **and to enjoy the product thereof.**

**It Being Useful and Honest.**

Note. It being useful and honest. On this phrase the teachings of the Roman Church was denied them. They were not useful or honest.

Article V. No man shall be compelled to work without his plain consent and without just compensation. The state will not permit to become effective any contract, pact or agreement with the purpose of the curtailment, the loss, or the irrevocable sacrifice of the liberty of any man, may the cause be for personal labor, education, or religious vows. The law in consequence **does not recognize monastic orders,** and will not permit their establishment, no matter what may be the denomination or purpose for which they pretend to be established. Neither will be permitted a contract or agreement by which a man makes a pact for his proscription or evil.

Here again the Constitution recognizes the human right. It declares null and void any scheme by which these rights through force or fraud may be relinquished.

He cannot sell himself.

It is the **man right placed** safely high above the **property right.**

Article XIII. In the Mexican Republic no one shall be subjected to private laws nor special courts. No man or corporation shall enjoy fueros nor receive emoluments unless they be a compensation for public services and already fixed by law.

Note: This article destroys clerical and military privilege and power.

Article XXVII. Private property shall not be taken without the consent of the owner, except in case of public utility, and by just payment therefor. Religious corporations or institutions no matter of what denomination, character, durability or purpose, and civil corporations when under the patronage, direction, or superintendency of religious institutions, or ministers of any cult, shall not have the legal capacity to acquire or manage any real estate except the buildings which are used immediately and directly for the service of the said institutions; neither will the law recognize any mortgage or any property held by these institutions.

Note: The phrasology is deep, sound, broad and strong. It was the knock-out blow against the vast illicit holdings of the church at the disposal of the people.

Article XXVIII. State and church are independent. Congress cannot make any law establishing or forbidding any religion.

**(From Keystone American.)**

Archbishop Blenk and other Romanish clamorers boldly assert that Bryan, when Secretary, had promised Cardinal Gibbons *et al.*, that our Government would not recognize any leader in Mexico who did not promise to satisfy the demands of Rome.

That amazing statement has been before the public ever since October 16th, *and Mr. Bryan has made no denial.*

What did he promise these Roman prelates? Did he agree to use the power of the United States to coerce some Mexican leader into subverting the Mexican laws and Constitution?

Mr. Bryan is in the race for the Presidency just as he has been for 20 years; and he is now campaigning the country (on the lecture basis) to alienate the people from the President.

If the statement which Archbishop Blenk makes *in his favor*, is true, Bryan will get the Romanist vote. But in that case, he should lose every Anti-Romanist vote.

He should be made to say whether Blenk's statement is the truth.

While the Blenk person is threatening the President from New Orleans, and roaring in favor of "religious liberty," let us see how matters go in a Roman Catholic Republic, farther South than Mexico. I quote from the New York Herald of Nov. 13, 1915:

(By Mexican Cable to The Herald.)

Lima, via Galveston, Texas, Friday.—**Scenes of wildest disorder characterized the enactment by Congress, in joint session here today, of the religious liberty bill, which became a law without the signature of the President. While the President of Congress stood on the Speaker's stand and read the promulgation of the measure, the**

**Rev. Sanchez Diaz, a priest and member of the Chamber of Deputies, sprang to the platform and, seizing the document, tore it to pieces.**

**The galleries were filled with men and women.** The women cheered Father Diaz. They shouted "Long live the Catholic religion!" while the men in the galleries cried out "Long live the devil!"

The women marched in a body to the floor of the Chamber and, surrounding Father Diaz, escorted him in triumph to his home.

When the police had been called in to disperse the crowd and to put down the demonstration, the President of Congress picked up the torn paper upon which the measure was written and continued the reading.

**In the galleries were scores of priests and women who had led the fight against the religious liberty law.** The demonstration began as soon as the measure came up for promulgation. It was one of the most riotous scenes ever witnessed in Congress.

After the measure was passed the bill went before President Partio for his signature. **Great influence was brought to bear on him for and against it and he finally refused to affix his signature.** It was returned to Congress and automatically became a law.

After the demonstration in the galleries and on the floor of Congress a large crowd of priests, women and persons who had opposed the enactment of the measure to the palace and demanded a speech from President Partio.

Will Archbishop Blenk come out in his paper with a denunciation of President Partio, warning him that he cannot oppose "religious liberty," *without paying the penalty?*"

Will Bishop Keily of Savannah roar us a roar on this Peruvian scene? Didn't Cardinal Gibbons preach a sermon to the pleasing tune that the Roman Church had always, everywhere, fought, bled annd nearly died for religious liberty?

That new law in Peru wont be worth shucks, so long as the whole Roman hierarchy are lawlessly and violently antagonizing it. The Pope's prelates cannot be pleased, unless they can dictate, persecute, suppress, and extirpate *independent thought*, both in Church and State. In Peru, they riot in the halls of Congress because Protestants are to be free to be such: in Mexico, they finance revolution, treason, and murder, because the Romanist organizations are not given the monopoly of power, of money of the schools, *and of the women*, that they used to have, before the revolts against Spanish landkings and Spanish high-priests.

In a leading Romanist magazine, December 1914, there is the following wail from Kelly, the editor of "Extension", an editor who claims to be appointed by the Pope, to edit this American publication:

"In 1789, William Pitt asked six of the leading Catholic Universities of Europe some questions regarding the loyalty claimed by the Pope from his children. The six Universities replied: "Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome has any civil power, authority or jurisdiction, or preeminence whatsoever in any kingdom." The same answer practically was given by the Pope himself to the Archbishops of Ireland in 1791. Of course, neither the statement of the Universities nor of the Pope himself would be believed by those who are concerned in fomenting the "anti-papal panic." In fact, that is the misery of it all. It is useless to say anything, unless to deny, useless to point out the Church's teachings. If Catholics agree with their traducers, they are telling the truth; if they disagree with them, they are lying. The task of making explanations is hopeless. The situation is as old as Christianity; it will live as long as Christianity lives. If the assault were not directed against Catholics, it would be against some other body. If there were no Catholics in the country, the largest and most powerful sect of Protestants would be selected. When we are at peace, we must be at war—and this is not so much of an Irish bull as it sounds. Strife is, I suppose, a part of a heritage of sin.

The answer to the Pope's hand-picked editor is three-fold—(1) There was never any strife and blood-shed among Christians until after the Roman bishops commenced to construct a vast worldly and paganistic despotism, using Christianity as a name to conjure with and to hide the real nature of the despotism;

(2) The answers to William Pitt were given to dupe him into removing all the political, disabilities which had been imposed upon them, because of the ferocious persecutions of Protestants

by papists in Great Britain, and because of the massacre of 40,000 Protestants *in one day, by the Roman* Catholics of Ireland.

The English minister, Pitt, swallowed the lie, and in due course the Romanists were given ample opportunities to renew their fight on Protestant liberties, with the result that the Pope's marriage law overrides the laws of the British realm, and the Catholics of Ireland are giving immense aid to Great Britain's enemies, in this European War.

(3) In these United States, we have evidence of the shameless falsehood of the answers given to William Pitt, when we see the Roman priests ordering Catholic husbands to desert Protestant wives, upon the ground that the Pope alone can make valid laws upon the subject of marriage.

A concrete instance, of recent date, is thus reported in the Macon, Ga., Telegraph, Nov. 5, 1915:

"Mrs. Edith May Boifeuillet alleged cruel mental treatment at the hands of her husband, Frank S. Boifeuillet. Testimony introduced in court showed that Mrs. Boifeuillet is a Baptist and that her husband is a Catholic, and that religious difference was the cause of remarks which she attributes to him, which she alleged caused her mental anguish and pain. It was stated that he told her that, because they had married out of the Catholic Church, the children were illigitimate. However, a first verdict was awarded on the ground of marriage procured by fraud. The plaintiff was represented by Attorney Nottingham.

The lady in this case was the granddaughter of Eden Taylor, one of the best known planters of middle Georgia —a deacon in the Baptist Church.

She married Boifeuillet in *strict conformity to the laws of Georgia*, and the fact, is of record in the Ordinary's office in Macon.

Apparently, they were living together happily, and were blessed with children; but the Italian Pope's infamous law was proclaimed in this country, and the priests ordered to enforce it. By that foreign law—the *Ne temere* decree—it was declared that *the civil power* of the State had no authority over *Catholic citizens* in the matter of marriage. In other words, *this foreigner*, the Italian Pope, *claimed the right to annul State laws.*

Such has been the law of the Italian Church ever since the Council of Trent, 1563; but it had never been proclaimed in this country, because the Catholics were not strong enough to brave public opinion. Now, however, it is different. Through unrestricted immigration, Protestant dry-rot, Foreign Missions fanaticism, and the combined venality and cowardice of our papers and politicians, the Romanists believe they are strong enough to introduce Papal foreign-law, to override ours.

Boifeuillet never even thought of his marriage as being illegal and never had an idea that he was the father of bastards, until after his treasonous priest instructed him on the Ne temere decree. *Then* he called his children illegitimate and his wife a concubine, in obedience to a foreign law which the infernal priest told him was binding on his "conscience."

To satisfy his "conscience," he committed the dastardly crime of disowning his own lawful wife and children.

To assume the salvation of what he takes to be his "soul," he deserts the woman whom he had vowed to love and protect, until *death*, not the Pope, should divide them.

To make himself certain of Heaven, he betrays a trusting wife, abandons his offspring, violating the laws of his State, wrecking the whole life of the one woman who ever loved him—or who ever will love him—leaving her blighted and helpless for she is neither wife, maid, nor widow.

And, strange to say, the Codes of all our civilized States, which make it a felony to steal a hog, and a capital crime to burn a dwelling, provide no punishment whatever for a guilty man who betrays a confiding woman, as this man did.

Does this foreign church control national politics, and national legislation, in purely *civil* affairs?

Can Cardinal Gibbons and his pack repeat what was said to William Pitt, namely, "Neither the Pope nor the Cardinals nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, *has any civil power*, authority, or jurisdiction, or preeminence whatsoever in *any* kingdom."

When the immigration bill was twice killed by the direct interposition of the Pope, and when he strenuously protested against the recognition of General Carranza, how could any sane American remain oblivious of *facts?*

Let us refresh our memories as to how the Burnett Immigration bill was knocked out:

The New York "Times" and other papers of February 17, 1914, contained the following:

"Indignation at Vatican.—Burnett Immigration Bill Is Declared to be an Anti-Catholic Measure.

Berlin, Feb. 17.—Dispatches from Rome say that the utmost indignation prevails in Vatican circles in Rome over the Burnett Immigration Bill.

The Papal authorities make no secret of their conviction that the Bill was conceived from deliberately anti-Catholic motives, and it is sincerely hoped that the United States Senate will kill it. Cabled reports of President Wilson's opposition to the literacy test evoke much satisfaction at the Vatican.

Italian, Austrian, and Hungarian Catholic immigrants would be those mainly affected by the Bill, it is stated, and at least 55 per cent of Italians would be excluded by the literacy test and 40 per cent Austro-Hungarians.

There is reason to believe that the Vatican is exerting such influence as it commands at Washington to bring pressure to bear in the direction of annihilating the Bill of the "Anti-Catholic" clause as the literacy provision is termed.

(When the Immigration Bill was up before the House in 1913, a number of telegrams were read from the hierarchy, all couched in very similar language of which the following are typical):

**"TELEGRAM.**

"Archbishop's House, St. Louis, Mo.
Jan. 15th, 1913.

Congressman L. C. Dyer, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: I am quite opposed to the illiteracy test. The real test for the immigrant should be character. I remain with excellent good wishes.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. GLENNON.
Archbishop of St. Louis."

(Congressional Record, Jan. 25, 1913, page 2,055).

No one can draw a character test. The illiteracy test, the exclusion of criminals, white slavers, and paupers,—all of which are in the immigration bill, are the best approximation to a character test that can be drawn. We compel our own native-born to learn to read in order to better fit them for earning a living, doing their own thinking, and intelligently participating in our public affairs, and why not require as much of foreign-born adults coming here, if for no other purpose than to compel certain foreign countries anxious to send cheap labor here to establish public schools—such schools would bring about needed reforms of all kinds over there and prove a blessing.

**TELEGRAM.**

"Cardinal's Residence, 408 N. Charles St.
Baltimore, Md., May 5, 1912.

My Dear Mr. Rosenau: I am not in favor of any educational test as applied to immigrants.

J. CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore."

b. "Rev. Fr. Alexander A. Syski, of St. Michael's Polish Catholic Church (Haverhill, Massachusetts), is heading a nation-wide fight against the Burnett Immigration Bill.

"Fr. Syski writes as follows:

"To the Editor of the Gazette: I have a copy of the Boston Polish Gazette of April 27, 1912, which contains an official advertisement of the Taft campaign committee and the most prominent feature of this advertisement is the statement that President Taft is against the Burnett Bill.

"Furhermore, when in Chicago (March 10, 1912) President Taft personally told Rt. Rev. Paul P. Rhode, the Polish auxiliary bishop that he would never sign the bill. I remain,

REV. A. SYSKI.

(Haverhill Gazette, June 20, 1912. Haverhill, Massachusetts, is in Congressman Gardner's district.)

Senator Stone saw Rhode, the only Polish Catholic Bishop in this country, in February, 1912, and made a deal for all the Polish Roman Catholic votes. Taft saw the Bishop "personally" March 10th, 1912, and made a deal for all their votes, Woodrow Wilson was in Chicago, April 16th to 19th, 1912, and lost his dress suit case or satchel while he was dining or lunching at a Roman Catholic Refectory with the same Rhode.

Last year, the Romanists celebrated with pomp and pageantry the half-century mark of the Catholic university at Washington City. The first money for this institution, they got from the Caldwell girls of Kentucky, by using the customary blandishments, persuasions, promises, etc., which they impose on susceptible young enthusiasts, and induce them in a moment of spiritual exaltation to lavish their money on the Roman Church, or to give themselves up to be the "Brides of Christ"—which too often means, "the concubines of the priests."

The Caldwell sisters, after they grew up, became intensely dissatisfied by the artful manner in which the "Holy ones of God" had bamboozled them out of their ducats. They quit the Catholic Church, and became its aggressive enemies. One of them, who married the Baron von Zedwitz, published a book against Popery, under the title of "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome."

The other Miss Caldwell became the Marquise des Monstiers, and she too, was extremely bitter against the American prelates whose rotten private lives she knew quite well, as the following letter will show. The letter was written to Jeremiah Crowley while he was a Romanist priest, of the highest standing; and it caused him to commence an investigation which led to his withdrawal from the Pope's corrupt priesthood:

"Hotel Suisse, Rome,
April 11, 1907.

Dear Father Crowley: I have just received your book and pamphlets, for which I thank you. I had seen and read the book last year in New York, and I shall have much pleasure in reading the brochures this summer. May heaven reward you for your noble work in showing up the awful depravity of the Roman Church.

If you ever have the opportunity to undeceive the world about that 'whited sepulchre', Spaulding of Peoria, I beg that you will do so in the sacred cause of truth. No greater liar and hypocrite walks the earth today. He is a very atheist and infidel, and I, who used to know him intimately, assert it. If today my sister and I are in open revolt against the Roman Church, it is chiefly due to the depravity of Bishop Spaulding. Would that you could let his priests know that his asceticism is all bombast! A more sensual hypocrite never trod the earth.

A letter to this address will always reach me.

Yours sincerely,
The Marquise des Monstiers."

In the spring of 1907 the Baroness von Zedtwitz sent the following cablegram from Europe to Bishop Spaulding:

"Bishop Spaulding,
Peoria, Illinois, U. S. A.,

Am aware of your efforts to shield yourself from exposure. When Catholics know the history of your hidden vices, as I do, you must flee Peoria. This I will accomplish.

Baroness von Zedtwitz."

Bishop Spaulding resigned the Peoria diocese in September, 1908, and was immediately promoted to an Archbishopric.

Says Rev. Crowley—"The abjuration of Roman Catholicism by these eminent women, and their charges against Archbishop Spaulding, who had been their professed friend and adviser for many years, stirred my soul."

It is becoming more and more apparent that the war in Europe is not one of Peoples, but of Jesuits, Pope, and Kings. The Jesuits gave it the real start, when they flung the armies of Roman Catholic Austria upon the Greek Catholic people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in violation of the Treaty of Berlin of 1878. For four years, the Roman Catholic troops waged barbarous war upon the Greek Catholic population of those two small States, and conquered them by mere weight of numbers. After this, Austrian carpet-baggers and Jesuits poured into the desolated provinces to seize upon all the offices.

This conquest of Bosnia and Herzegovina—in which the Berlin Treaty was torn up, as another "scrap of paper"—was made with the connivance of William Hohenzollern, the Emperor of Germany. The Jesuits whom Bismarck had banished were permitted to return after the Great Chancellor fell, and they at once began their plots against social democracy and against Protestantism.

In a short while, they had organized in the German Parliament such a

Pope-ruled body of members, that, like the Irish in the Parliament of Great Britain, they held the balance of power between the Imperialists and the social democrats. With the balance of power, they forced concession after concession from the Kaiser's Imperialists, as the price of voting the prodigious appropriations—taxes—which financed the Militarism now endangering the democracy of the whole world.

Not only did the German autocrat send an ambassador to the Pope, but he went in person to the Vatican, bearing rich gifts. It was easy for the Pope and the Jesuits to convince a man of William's egomaniac character, that an absolute Church-Monarch (the Pope) is the natural ally of the absolute State-Monarch. It was easy to inflame such a man as William Hohenzollern with the ambition to become another Charles V, Emperor of all Central Europe, and arbiter of nations.

Ever since William went to Rome and had his personal interview with Pope Leo XIII., he has been more papist than Lutheran. He has been in closer touch with papal States, than with Protestant. He has been closer ally to Catholic Austria than to Lutheran Holland.

Therefore, he was Austria's silent partner in the breaking of the Berlin Treaty and in the brutal subjugation of the Balkan States. With his stupendous military "preparedness," he was able to intimidate the rest of Europe into acquiescence during the years of carnage in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Then when the Jesuit campaign against Greek Catholic Servia was set on foot, the Emperor of Germany was again a silent partner to the outrage.

Servia had not given cause of war to any of her neighbors. Her people are a home-loving people, who have never in all their history waged a war of conquest, and who on account of their geographical position in the Balkans have often protected Christian Europe from Mohammedan and barbarian inroads. It was while bravely battling for the salvation of Europe from the Turks, that Servia suffered the terrible defeat at Kossovo, which broke her power.

But after bearing the Turkish yoke for two centuries, the Serbs finally won back their independence, during the latter part of the last century; and she was asking nothing of the world, save the right of self-government.

The Jesuits and the two Emperors were determined that the fate of Bosnia and Herzegovina should be that of Servia also; and they began by forcing the old King Peter, to sign a submission to the Italian Pope.

The most offensive articles of this treaty with the Pope, were those which compelled the Greek-Catholic taxpayers to pay the salaries of Roman Catholic Archbishops of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub, "with the right to a pension at least equal to that of the employees of the State;" also the surrender to these Roman Catholic prelates of control of the schools within their jurisdiction, and the payment of the salaries of these Romanist schoolteachers by the State; also the establishment of a seminary for the education of Servian youth for the Roman priesthood, *at the expense of the State;* also, the humiliating concession, that all marriages between Romanists and Greeks must be performed by a Romanist priest, else they would be no marriages at all; and that *the children of all mixed marriages must be brought up in the Roman faith.*

If *the wife* was a Romanist, the children must be educated as Romanists; and if *the husband* was Romanist, the same rule was to apply.

Thus, neither the Greek Catholic husband, nor the Greek Catholic wife were to be permitted to give their children the chance to be other than Romanist foot-kissers and God-eaters.

This infamous Treaty was signed at the Vatican in July 1914, under the auspices of Pope Pius X, and by Cardinal Merry del Val, the arrogant Spaniard who made such a mess of the French separation business, and who so bitterly opposed religious liberty in Spain.

Is it any marvel that the Greek

Catholics of Servia were thrown into a frenzy of indignation when they learned that Austria had forced upon the aged King Peter a Treaty so insulting and so ruinous to Greek Catholicism?

Is it any wonder that a youthful hothead should shoot the Austrian Archduke who was justly considered the prime mover in all this carnival of crime against the Greek Catholics of the Balkan States.

Just such a situation nearly always produces assassinations; but never before was the crime of one fanatic made the pretext for world-war, as in the case of the murder at Serajevo.

The war has lasted little more than a year, but its secret purpose is already plainly in evidence. In Bavaria, was held the first assemblage of Romanist dignitaries to discuss the ways and means of re-establishing the Temporal Power of the Popes. Bavaria is a part of the German Empire, and is almost entirely Catholic. At the meeting held in October, nothing definite was agreed on, so far as we are allowed to know. But more recently, other steps have been taken in the same direction. For instance, Germany's most skilful diplomat has been holding conferences with the real ruler of the Roman Catholic world, namely, the General of the Jesuits, as will be seen in the following news item:

Rome, Nov. 10, (via Paris, Nov. 11).—Despite denials that Prince Von Beulow is in Switzerland on a peace mission or that the Vatican is taking any part in preliminary peace negotiations, a Zurich dispatch to Messaggero asserts that the former German with Father Ledochowski, general of the Society of Jesus, known as the "Black Pope," who came to Lucerne at the request of Prince Vno Beulow.

The two men are said to have been in conference several hours, after which the Jesuit leader sent a long report to the Pope.

Additional light is thrown upon this true secret of the war by the following:

Special Correspondent of the International News Service.

Berlin, Oct. 31.—According to an exclusive statement given to me by the foreign office, the status of the pope will be fixed by the peace negotiations after the war is ended.

A high state officer told me officially that the world status of the pontiff and his immunity from interference by the worldly powers will be one of the most important matters to be settled when peace is concluded.

Count Hertling, the Bavarian prime minister, has issued a statement saying:

"German and Austrian diplomats have had the greatest difficulty in communicating with the pope on account of the war. These conditions must be altered. The assurances given by Italy when Rome was taken by Italy were repudiated the first time they were put to the test."

Count Hertling cited the pope's circular letter of Nov. 1, 1914, in which Pope Benedict says:

"All far and near who call themselves children of the pope have the right to demand valid assurances that their common father, in the exercise of his apostolic office, be free and appear to be free from the influence of worldly potentates. Therefore, with a sincere longing for a peace to come as soon as possible, we add our wish that the head of the church should remain no longer in this unnatural position, a position detrimental to the peace of nations in more than one respect. '

**Pope's Rights Invaded.**

Italy granted certain privileges to the pope when the Italians took the Holy See. Among others was the guarantee that his communication with the dignitaries of the church should be absolutely free.

German papers now charge that German bishops are unable to communicate with the Vatican. Letters to and from the pope fail to reach their destination. German and Austrian diplomats were forced to leave the Vatican because their lives were threatened by an unruly mob. This in spite of the fact that Italy had promised safety to all diplomatic agents accredited to the Vatican.

In an editorial on this subject the Vossische Zeitung says the independence of the pope cannot be left to the Italians alone; that rather this is a matter which concerns the Catholics of the whole world.

The paper continues:

"The Italian law guaranteeing the independence of the pope is worth no more than the scrap of paper it is written on. The Catholics of the world and the governments of all the states have the right to demand that the pope's independence be better safeguarded than by a single state, which, bandit-like, has just now stabbed in the back its ally of many years' standing."

Personally, I tried to get a statement

from the archbishop of Cologne, but failed. I was told, however, he had been out of communication with the Vatican for months, and that, as a consequence, the archbishop was all at sea.

What's the matter with Christian education?

Bishop Candler educates Wilberforce Farmer to be a Methodist, and he flops to Rome; while another young man, at about the same time, flopped to Protestants, after having been educated to be a priest.

Read the story, as it appears in The Friendly Visitor, Atlanta.

We are glad to favor our readers with the likeness of Brother Evarice Herbert, now identified with the church of Christ at Iota, La.

After eight years schooling preparatory to entering the priesthood, and seven years missionary labors to the priesthood, he finally learned the Truth and renounced his allegiance to Roman Catholicism. The story is very interesting, but space will permit only a brief statement. He came in contact with one of our brethren who challenged one of his statements. The arguments grew somewhat heated, and when he returrned to his home, he wept over the idea of his word being so confidently challenged by our brother. He got his Bible and searched in vain for the scripture to substantiate what he had affirmed. This was the beginning, and he soon read himself out of Romanism and resigned.

"Robert's Cove," one of his missions with one hundred members and a chapel not dedicated to the "Mother church," he re-organized and called "Church of Christ, Son of the Living God." He discarded their images, relics, etc. Efforts were made by a French Presbyterian minister and other ministers who represented human organizations that still hold to some of the "relics of Rome" to get him to line up with them, but Brother Herbert was hungering for God's will to be done. About this time Brother Stanford Chamber's tract, "The Whole Counsel of God on Baptism," fell into his hands and he discovered that he had not been baptized. During a meeting conducted by Brothers W. P. Johnson and Chambers at Iota, La., they heard of this seeker after the Truth and Brother Johnson was driven over to his home which resulted in his being buried with Christ in baptism. Since his baptism, a little more than three months ago, he has baptized two hundred and thirty-five Catholics into Christ. To God be all the praise.

S. H. H.

The only safety for Protestant churches and Protestant principles lies in the motto—"*No compromise wit Rome.*"

The moment conciliations begin, concessions get ready to follow; and the moment concessions are made, the foundations of Protestantism begin to crack and crumble.

Consider that Trojan Horse, the Gary School System, to which Protestant ministers have agreed. It provides for *Church* teaching in *State* schools; and thus it insidiously favors *Roman principles*, at the very fountain heads of education and public opinion.

It is amazing to me, that the Protestant clergymen of New York do not see the peril of so great a concession to Rome.

Once condone the union of Church affairs with State affairs, in so vital a matter as education, and the precedent will be used hereafter to sacrifice other Protestant principles. Every time a principle is sacrificed to Rome, *that much ground is irrecoverably lost.*

*ROME NEVER CONCEDES AN INCH!*

Consider the following statement published by the Guardians of Liberty:

In December of last year a committee of the National Court, Guardians of Liberty presented certain charges before a committee of the Board of Education of New York City, the committee including President Churchill, Superintendent Maxwell and Mr. Geo. J. Gillespie, Chairman of the Elementary School Committee. The charges were of a very serious nature involving proselyting in the school rooms and similar matters. At the meeting it was suggested that our Committee secure further data and present it in more definite form at a later meeting.

This we agreed to do and on March 6, 1915 we presented evidence of a most important nature. The evidence proved that in one school the children were obliged to fill in cards and state on the cards the religion of their parents and the Sunday School they (the children) attended. It proved further that in one school **Protestant children were abused and struck with rulers in the hands of Public School teachers because they asserted their rights as American Protestant School children in refusing to get into line in the school in order to be marched to a church or paro-**

**chial school to receive the catechism of the Roman Catholic Church. Serious charges. Substantiated charges.** This happened in March, the first meeting was in December. In January we had the complete stenographic record of the December meeting but in spite of repeated writing to Secretary Palmer, Assistant Secretary Johnson, President Churchill and Mr. Gillespie of the Board of Education we have not yet received the transcribed minutes of the March meeting. Mr. Gillespie advised us months ago by telephone that he had them but had no time to look them over, but that action had been taken by Superintendent Maxwell. It also appears that the Principal of the school where the children suffered because of known religious beliefs has been transferred.

We cite this to bring to the attention of the people of this city the fact that any system that will permit of **religious indexing, or segregation** is both dangerous and at complete variance with the fundamental principal of Common School education.

There is danger in the introduction of any system of religious education in the Common Schools unless some method may be found whereby the instruction is non sectarian in character, possibly optional, and certainly acceptable to all religions and religious denominations or sects. No such plan has as yet been presented and in its place we are confronted with a plan that at once, and by necessity, requires some sort of census of religious connections and card indexing of children by religions. It must be obvious that this **offers exceptional opportunity for proselyting, favoritism, discrimination, and even persecution.** Is this a real danger? In answer we beg to call attention to the following which occurred before the Gary Plan was really launched in the city and before the religious features were included.

In the Knoxville *Journal and Tribune*, appears the following:

Prior to the Civil War the war department had charge of the Indians. Since then the interior department has, while Governor Floyd was secretary of war a delegation of a half dozen great Indian chiefs visited him. They had on their best clothes, their garments covered with beads of various colors, and their heads with feathers of the brightest hues. Governor Floyd received them with great cordiality, shaking hands with all of them and after hearing a statement of their grievances against the dishonest government agents and others who were robbing them he told them he would see that justice was done them. The interpreter who accompanied them had explained to the chiefs that the secretary was their "Great Father" who could take care of them.

The governor thought he could impress them favorably by having the interpreter tell them that he was of Indian blood himself. Now this statement was not believed by the Indians because while his complexion was very dark his raven black hair was curly. The hair of the Indian as everybody knows, is as straight as a ram rod. Clustering close about him the Indian chiefs looked at his curly hair, grunted, shook their heads and said: "No! No! No! Not Indian but 'nigger nigger, nigger.'" Governor Floyd was one of the finest looking men I ever saw, about six feet tall, weighed about 200 pounds with a very large head and handsome face. He was good-natured and enjoyed telling this story on himself.

In striking contrast to Floyd's good nature I will tell of Col. Roosevelt's interview with a delegation of Indian chiefs. The secretary of the interior department reported to President Roosevelt that a large body of Indians were about to go on the war path, that they claimed that the greedy settlers were encroaching upon their lands and the government agents had been swindling them both of which charges were doubtless true and he advised the President to send a discreet man to see them and if possible prevent their taking to the war path. To this the Colonel replied: "Send an agent to bring them to ME. I will talk to them." This was done and arrayed in their feathers and beads several big chiefs were ushered into the big east room of the white house. Colonel Roosevelt had prepared for a spectacular performance which he expected would be featured in double page pictures in the illustrated weeklies. He had invited the correspondents of leading ewspapers to be present. After shaking hands with the chiefs the colonel said: "As your Great Father I have been distressed to learn that you have been badly treated and I have sent for you to tell you that I shall put a stop to it." He then paused until the interpreter in the Indian language, could tell them what the President had said. This done the chiefs grunted and shouted: "Wak-e-ta, wak-e-ta, wak-e-ta." Resuming Colonel Roosevelt said: "I love my red children as much as I do my white children and I am determined that you shall be justly treated." When this was interpreted again the Indians grunted and said: "Wak-e-ta, wak-e-ta, wak-e-ta." Then Colonel Roosevelt turned to the interpreter and asked what, in the Indian vernacular, "Wak-e-ta" meant? The interpreter, with much embarrassment said it meant "humbug." Thereupon the Colonel got mad and ordered the interpreter to take them away at once.

The truth is that the Indians had been lied to by so many white men that they naturally thought that the colonel was another Ananias.

JOHN B. BROWNLOW.

Knoxville, Nov. 1, 1915.

### "CHURCH FINANCED HUERTA"

**So Says One of Huerta's Leaders in a Confession to United State's Officials—Why Are Not Church Officials Arrested?**

El Paso, Tex., Nov. 5.—Colonel Jose Orozco, cousin of General Pascual Orozco, has made a confession to United States Assistant District Attorney R. E. Crawford, regarding the plot which he says General Victoriano Huerta formed to invade Mexico from the United States, establish his provisional capital in Juarez, and march on Mexico City.

The confession followed the arrest and conviction of Colonel Orozco on a neutrality charge. He is now in the county jail awaiting departure for Leavenworth Prison to serve eighteen months on a charge of violating the neutrality laws, and his confession is said to have followed the refusal of prominent local Huertistas to give bond for him pending his appeal.

According to him, the plot originated while Huerta was in New York after his return from Spain. The church is said by Orozco to have been concerned in the financing of this revolution. General Pascual Orozco was selected as the Commander in Chief, and General Jose Ynez Salizar, now in jail at Santa Fe, N. M., was to have been second in command.

Colonel Orozco, according to the report of his confession, was to organize the troops, equip them from among the refugees on this side and send them against Jaurez from the American side. He admits having armed 200 of these men with a part of the first shipment of 6,000 rifles which were sent here, together with 10,000,000 rounds of ammunition, 60 machine guns, and unlimited supplies. The arrest of Orozco and Huerta spoiled the plan, and it was never sufficiently revived to make it operative.

A number of prominent civil officials here, in San Antonio, and in New York are declared to be implicated in the Huerta plot and to have arranged for the financing and for the equipment of the invading army.

Indictments are expected to follow here, at San Antonio, and New York as soon as the confession can be corroborated.

### HOW THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND GENERAL HUERTA MURDERED PRESIDENT MADERO.

(Special to The World.)

New Orleans, La., Oct. 30.—Following the publication this morning by The New Orleans Item of The New York World's Washington dispatch, giving the alleged confession of Major Francisco Cardenas that he killed Mexican President Madero at the instigation of General Blanquet, Felix Diaz, Manuel Mondragon and Celilio Ocon, with the connivance of Huerta, the greatest excitement prevailed in the big Mexican colony. Among the 4,000 members of the different factions it was the sole topic of conversation. Mexicans here held many meetings in hotel rooms and private residences.

A few seemed to doubt that Cardenas had confessed, charging that the story was given out by the Carranza representatives in Washington. But those on the inside of Mexican affairs, without exception, admitted that the story of the killing of Madero was true to the minutest detail.

On Saturday evening, when The World's despatch was ordered, a Diaz and Huerta leader was in the Item office. He waited until it came. Before he saw the message he was told that Cardenas had been arrested in Guatemala and had confessed.

"I know it," he said, "and it looks bad for Felix. The last time General Diaz was here his friends told me Diaz said that when Cardenas protested at killing Madero, Diaz, said to him: 'He (Madero) is only a little fellow.' When the despatch was shown him and this exact expression was in the text of Cardenas's confession, he put his finger on the line and said: 'There it is, and the other details are right, too, as I heard them.' "

Carranza's followers are jubilant at The World's expose. Others are depressed, many saying they will not be able to return to Mexico. At the house on St. Charles Avenue where the Felix Diaz family is said to reside admission was denied to all except his trusted lieutenants.

In discussing the Cardenas story a former Huerta official, who naturally requests that his name be not used, said:

"They certainly made a bungling job of putting Madero out of the way. Huerta was overruled, according to my information. He wanted them to Put Madero on a train and to have it either wrecked or attacked. This could have been explained. Even after he had been killed in the manner he was, the job was still bungled. General Ocon urged that Cardenas be put out of the way so as to forever seal his lips. This was never done, and now his talk has apparently spilled all the beans. Even if the story of his arrest and confession is untrue, the version of the killing of Madero is substantially correct. Too many people here and elsewhere got to talking about it, and the Carranza people may have got the details that way."

### IMPORTANT HISTORICAL DOCUMENT.

The following is the treaty which Jesuits of Austria forced upon King Peter of Servia.

Remember that there were 3,000,000

Greek Catholics, and only 10,000 Roman Catholics in the country when this astounding surrender to the Roman Papacy was made.

### TEXT OF THE PAPAL CONCORDAT WITH SERVIA, JUNE 24, 1914.

Read this union-of-church-and-state document, and note the bigoted, intolerant, religious monopoly spirit which permeates it. The signing of this concordat was the spark which caused the present European conflagration. Rome's boast is that what she has done for other nations she will do for the United States. Should her boast carry, the ruin of the United States would be inevitable. Here is the Dark Age document:

Article 1. The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion shall be freely and publicly exercised in the Realm of Servia

II. In the Realm of Servia is constituted an Ecclesiastical Province, composed of the Archdiocese of Belgrade, with its seat in the capital of the Realm, and having as its territory that which is comprised in the limits of Servia, as it was before the Treaties of London and Bucharest; and of the suffragan Diocese of Uskub, with its seat in that city, comprising the new territories, and passing from the jurisdiction of Propaganda Fide to the regime of the common law.

III. The Archbishop of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub, to whose respective ecclesiastical jurisdiction belong all the Catholics of the Realm of Servia, shall depend, for ecclesiastical affairs, directly and exclusively on the Holy See.

IV. His Holiness, before naming definitely the Archbishop of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub, shall notify the Royal Government the person of each candidate, in order to know whether there exist facts or motives of a political nature in his regard.

V. The Archbishop of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub shall receive from the Royal Government an annual allowance, the former of 12,000 dinars, plus an indemnity of 4,000 dinars; with the right to a pension at least equal to that of the employees of the State.

VI. The official title of the Archbishop of Belgrade and of the Bishop of Uskub shall be "Most Illustrious and Most Reverent Monsignor."

VII. Before entering on office, the Archbishop of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub shall take an oath of fidelity in the presence of a delegate of the Royal Government in the following terms: "I swear and promise, before God and on the Holy Gospel, obedience and fidelity to His Majesty the King of Servia; I promise not to take part in any compact, nor to assist in any council, and not to encourage the clergy under my orders or allow them to co-operate in any enterprise tending to trouble the tranquility of the state."

VIII. The Archbishop of Belgrade and the Bishop of Uskub shall have full liberty in the exercise of the ecclesiastical functions and in the direction of their dioceses, and they shall be able to exercise all the rights and prerogatives of their pastoral ministry, following the discipline approved by the Church; in their respective dioceses, all the members of the Catholic clergy depend on them in everything concerning the exercise of the sacred ministry.

IX. To the Archbishop of Belgrade and to the Bishop of Uskub belongs the right, in their respective Dioceses, of creating Parishes, in accord with the Royal Government. To them alone belongs the right of nominating the Parish priests. Still, in the case of persons who are foreigners to the Realm, they shall proceed by agreement with the Royal Government; and in the case of Servian subjects the Bishops shall previously ascertain from the competent ministry as to whether there exist facts or motives of a political or civil character regarding them.

X. The religious instruction of Catholic youth is subject in all the schools to the Archbishop and the Bishop in their respective Dioceses. In the State School it shall be given by Catechism Teacners who shall be nominated, after agreement made in common, by the Bishop and the Minister of Public Instruction and Worship. The Bishops can forbid the giving of religious instruction in the State Schools by Catechism Teachers who show themselves unfit for the mission thus entrusted to them, by informing on the matter the Minister of Public Instruction and Worship in order to proceed to another nomination. The Royal Government shall remunerate the Catechism Teachers in the State Schools. The Office of Parish Priest is not incompatible with that of the Catechism Teacher.

XI. In order to form young Servians suitable for the Catholic Priesthood, there shall be instituted in the Capital or in its environs a Seminary to which the State shall furnish an equitable Annual Endowment, the respective Eccleciastical authority being charged with the care of organizing it and directing it according to the Canonical dispositions. In this Seminary the Servian language shall be employed as the medium of instruction in non-ecclesiastical subjects.

XII. The Royal Government recognizes the validity of marriages between Catholics and of mixed marriages contracted to the laws of the Church.

XIII. Matrimonial causes between Catholics, and between parties to mixed marriages celebrated before the Catholic Parish Priest, except as far as concerns

purely civil effects, shall be judged by the Catholic Ecclesiastical Tribunals.

XIV. The Catholic party shall have the right to establish that the children born of mixed marriages, celebrated before the Catholic Priest, shall be brought up in the Catholic Religion.

XV. The prayer, for the Sovereign, Domine salvum fac regem, shall be sung at the Divine offices in the Slav or Latin language according to local conditions.

XVI. The State recognizes that the Church, represented by its legitimate authorities and by its hierarchical orders, has a true and proper judicial personality, and enjoys the capacity of exercising the rights which belong to it.

XVII. The Church has the right to acquire legally, to possess, and administer freely, property, real and personal, destined to serve for the ends proper to the Church and its institutions in the Realm, and the objects purchased by it, and its foundations, are inviolable as the private property of the citizens of the State.

XVIII. The property of the Church shall be subject to the public imposts, always excepting the edifices destined for divine worship, the seminaries, and the houses of the Bishop and parish priests, which shall be exempt from taxes and can never be destined or employed for another use.

XIX. The priests and clerics, secular and regular, can never be obliged to exercise public employment opposed to their sacred ministry and to the sacerdotal life.

XX. In the future, should any difficulty arise about the interpretation of the present Articles or about questions which may happen not to be contemplated in them, the Holy See and the Royal Government shall proceed by common accord, to an amicable solution, in harmony with the canon law.

XXI. The present Convention shall enter into force immediately after its ratification by His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff and Mis Majesty the King of Servia.

XXII. The ratification shall be exchanged in Rome with the least possible delay."

According to the **Tablet** (July 4, 1914). the Concordat was signed by Cardinal Merry del Val and Dr. Vesnitch, plenipotentiaries respectively of the Holy See of Servia."

All signs indicate that the German Kaiser and the Pope have signed another Holy Alliance, against the people's democratic principles, and modern progress. This being so, the following extract from the secret treaty of the infamous "Holy Alliance" of 100 years ago, is most illuminating:

### DARK AGES OF 1822.

From Elliot's Diplomatic Code, Vol 2, p 179

### SECRET TREATY OF VERONA.

The undersigned, specially authorized to the **TREATY OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE**, after having exchanged their respective credentials have agreed as follows:

Art. 1. The high contrasting powers being convinced that the system of representative government is equally incompatible **with the monarchial principles, as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people will the divine right,** engage mutually, in the most solemn manner to use all their efforts **to put an end to the system of representativo governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe,** and to prevent it being introduced **in those countries when it is not yet known.**

Art. 2. As it cannot be doubted that **the liberty of the press is the most powerful means used by the pretended supporters of the rights of nations, to the detriment of those of princes,** the high contracting parties promise reciprocally, to adopt all proper measures **TO SUPPRESS IT, not only in their own states, but also in the rest of Europe.**

Art. 3. Convinced that the principles of religion contribute most powerfully to **keep nations in the state of passive obedience which they owe to their princes,** the high contracting parties declare it to be their intention to sustain, in their respective states, **those measures which the clergy may adopt,** with the aim of ameliorating their own interests, so intimately connected with **the preservation of THE AUTHORITY OF PRINCES;** and the contracting powers join in offering their thanks **TO THE POPE, for what he has already done for them, and solicit his constant co-operation in their vi ws of submitting the nations.**

Made at Verona the 22nd of November, 1822.

Signed for Austria, Metterninch; for France, Chasteaubriand; for Prussia Bernsett; for Russia, Nesselrode.

# Letters from the Plain, Common Folks

### A LETTER FROM A POOR JEW.

Dear Sir: Permit me to state to you, as briefly as I can, a case that may perhaps interest you because of its bearing upon an experience of your own which caused you, I firmly believe, a great deal of pain.

You have been severely criticised ever since you made a certain stand in connection with the Frank case. The bitterest attack came, and still comes, from so-called leading representatives of Jewish thought and opinion. You and your beloved state have been accused of the grossest kind of anti-semitism by the Jewish Press.

The Frank case is now closed as far as Frank himself is concerned. He is no longer among the living, but self styled preachers of justice think that their mission is not finished as yet, that they must continue to uncover imaginary facts in order to appear before the world as champions of justice and, especially, justice to the Jew.

This propaganda comes mostly from certain Eastern States where Jewish opinion is predominently making itself felt. The Jewish Press, appearing before the American Democracy as champions of every just and honorable case, and supposing itself ready to back any one falsely accused to the limits of their ability, have miserably failed in an instant which your humble servant desires to present before you. They have failed, and that was deliberately done, to do justice to one of their own race for the simple reason because he was an insignificant individual and they would not have derived any glory thereby. It was a case of simple justice with bare facts laid before their eyes; but they closed their eyes tightly to all of it.

They are always ready to champion the cause of any Jew who has a doubtful sad record behind him but will close their eyes to an appeal for justice when at least twelve honorable bodies of organized labor, of the city of Montreal, Canada, sent their approval of the justice of my cause to the General Executive Board of Control of the Workman's Circle, New York, (Jewish). Why have they done so? Please let me give you a brief of the case. For seventeen and a half months I was kept locked up in Matteawan and six months in the Tombs Prison because of a conspirasy of ignorant people of my race when the facts in the case clearly proved my innocence.

Dear Sir, I believe you to be a man of justice in spite of the fact of what the Jewish press has to say to the contrary. Frank is dead but I have been living a living death all these years and would therefore respectfully ask the kindness that you would give me an opportunity to submit to you all the facts in the case and, if you should deem it wise, have the same published in your valuable paper.

I firmly believe the material I would furnish would prove to the American people as well as to the whole civilized world that there is very little justice to be had in New York County largely because of Jewish dominance and influence upon the courts of justice.

Will you please grant me this privilege? If, after I have submitted to you all the facts in the case and you think best not to have them appear in your columns, I shall nevertheless be grateful to you for having given me an opportunity, at least, to present my cause before you.

Hoping to hear a favorable answer, I am, dear sir,

Very respectfully yours,

FRANK GINSBURG.

P. S. I am enclosing a circular of the Yiddish language, which was sent by the Montreal Organizations mentioned in the letter. Should you be favoraoly inclined to my request, I shall then have this and some other material translated into the English. I will just give you one single paragraph of the circular in order that you may have an idea who the person is that makes this appeal to you. The underscored lines only are translated.

"Examining the facts in this case we have come to the conclusion that no artistic pen has as yet been able to transmit (to others) the auto-biography of this martyr."

F. G.

(I have invited Mr. Ginsburg to send me his story.—T. E. W.)

---

### A TEXAN WHO REGRETTED ACTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE.

Ivanhoe, Texas, Oct. 31, 1915.

Esteemed Sir: Within a few days I will be 75 years old, and have raised two families, and have several great-grandchildren. My present family consists of my second wife and our two youngest children, 19 and 16 years of age. But I am still

able to manage and aid in keeping the wolf from the door of our humble home. As you know, I have long been a subscriber for your excellent magazine. While differing with you in some things, yet in the main I endorse you as an editor and historian.

And now despite the infirmities of age and the urgent duties of a still busy life, I feel it a duty to write and thank you for your able, fearless, and exhaustive exposure of Romanism, and the case of Leo Frank.

And right here I must say that all words are utterly inadequate, and my pen is too old and feeble to vent a little of my gratitude to you. I believe that honesty and heroism should always be applauded, and flowers should not always be reserved for the dead alone.

If that trifling negro, who tried to aid Frank in concealing his awful crime, had been tried and executed, then the fanatics of the North would have never ceased to howl about the cruelty of Southern whites toward the negro race. And I rejoice to know that the grand old State of Gorgia, the home of my Huguenot ancestry, and the present home of many of my kindred; has shown to all the world, that even handed justice will be meted out alike, to the rich white brute, and the beastly black brute.

As a Texan I was sorry and ashamed when the lower house of our Legislature, went so far out of its way as to meddle in this Frank trial.

But of all the papers which espoused the cause of Frank, none was more surprising than that which has always been regarded as a true reform sheet, viz, "The Public," of Chicago.

Verily, it was no mob that hung Leo Frank, and if that execution was not strictly legal, it was surely equitable, and in strict accord with the wish of every honest person on earth who knew the facts of the case.

The future governors of Georgia and all other states, should be speedily deprived of the power to nullify the verdict of 12 jurors who may be legally selected, and accepted by both parties, for the trial of any court.

Luck and long life to you, Mr. Watson, is the wish of your friend and subscriber,

J. E. DEUPREE.

---

### BELIEVES IN SPREADING WATSON'S MAGAZINE.

Dear Sir: Your August, September and October Magazines are certainly great, a fine form, stuffed with truth and true light in dealing with the Leo. M. Frank case.

I ordered twenty numbers of the August magazine, ($2.00), and ten of the September number, ($1.00) to put out with editors, judges annd lawyers and some friends who did not know the truth.

I have not had one to believe in Frank's innocence after reading any of these numbers of your magazine.

The public at large should know the truth, so Mr. Watson I would suggest that you write a full condensed history of the Frank case and have this published and paper bound, so as to sell at 15 or 25 cents per copy; a book of 100 or 150 pages would suffice, and I hope after you have such a history ready for the press that the good officials of the state of Georgia, will appropriate money enough to place at least 50,000 copies of this crime history into circulation all over the United States. so as to let the people at large know the truth, and so the good name of the Southern people will be redeemed.

Long live Tom Watson, and may health and strength hold to him tlil the end so that the common people shall benefit from his true American ideals in all that he can say in word and by his pen.

Yours very sincerely,

W. EDWIN TRIBBLE.

**(Answer)**

(The September number or our Magazine fills the bill. We have a good supply on hand.—T. E. W.)

---

### "GOLD AND SILVER ARE THE MONEY OF THE CONSTITUTION."

Dear Sir: Your very much appreciated favor of the 25th read. Our librarian showed me the list of magazines, prepared to be submiitted to the board of trustees, that will be ordered for the current year. Watson's is included, but am almost certain the trustees will cut it out. Before attempting any further proceedings in the matter of having it unchanged are waiting to see what action they will take in connection with its renewal.

In the meantime I would like to call your attention to a suggested conclusion of the author of an article—"What Is Money," etc., by Col. Archie Fisk, in the October number. On page 346, Col. Fisk says: "It seems to have been left to Congress to determine alike what metal shall be coined, its purity, and how far its statutory value as money shall correspond from time to time with the market value as the same metal as bullion." I am just now reading the "Life of James G. Blaine," by John Clark Redpath. On page 272, Mr. Blaine says: "I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution, money which the organic law of the Republic recognized as independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has, there-

fore, in my judgment, no more power to demonetize either than to demonetize both."

In this statement I am but repeating the weighty **dictum** of the first of constitutional lawyers. "I am certainly of the opinion," said Mr. Webster, "that gold and silver at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard.

"We have always had the system of bi-metallism, which is simply a concession to the debtor that he shall enjoy the valuable option of paying freely in the cheaper of two metals, or the more convenient, as the case may be."

Mr. Blaine delivered a speech in the Senate on the thesis "That gold and silver are the money of the Constitution and Congress **has the right to regulate** their relations. Commenting on Blaine's flop, the author says:

"This, of course, would imply that the silver standard should be altered and adjusted to the gold standard, and this is not bi-metallism at all, but monometallism."

My religion, my life, here and hereafter (if there is any) is voluntarily made dependent on the obtaining of two provisions of our fundamental law at their **face value**, viz.: "No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts," and "No person holding any office of **profit** or **trust** under them shall, without the consent of Congress, accept of any present, emolument, **office** or **title of any kind whatever** from any king, prince or **foreign State**"—neither Jesuit or Jew in the enforcement of the former, no Jesuit in the fulfillment of the latter. As the educational franchise is the most sacred office of trust within our bestowing —exercised by the Italian papacy in our country in conflict with our law—what a magnificent opportunity for Mr. Burnett, of Alabama, who has made such a gallant struggle (and who, in my humble opinion, is the only Democrat who would be "in the money" at all in our next Presidential election) against these afore-mentioned powers with his immigration bill! After he has made this measure "stick," what a splendid opening for him to "call the turn" on the opposition, by initiating a proposal in Congress for enforcing this prohibitory clause of our Constitution. Not only that, but, you know, we **must** centralize the nation-wide sentiment already aroused on some one, practical, affirmative proceeding. A measure such as the one I suggest would receive a mighty chilly, scornful reception, on its first introduction in Congress. But if a heroic character like Mr. Burnett were behind it ,backed up by the mighty phalanx of awakened, determined Americans, we need have no fear of the final outcome.

Through this Jew-Jesuit inspiration, having an almost unearthly, non-human insight into the characteristics of the nationality that would best subserve their interests, Germany and Holland, after securing seven-eighths of our bonded indebtedness, owned out of this country, with the aid of the Sherman family, the biggest asset, in the family line, Roman Catholic intrigue ever owned, exploded its first torpedo into the bowels of real American ideals—Roosevelt and the "Prince of Peace," the Nebraska mouth-harp, with the aid of the holy-water imbecile, doing the parrot act for the invisible government, through two mediums, Tumulty and the Kuen Loeb Jew in charge of our monetary affairs, who, while occupying the greatest office within the gift of **men**, wilfully placed himself in the category of cheap lairs, to curry favor with his masters, when in his "New Declaration of Freedom" he made the statement "that the world's civilization would have never survived the Dark Ages but for the democracy of the Catholic priesthood. Through these, with the aid of their Collier's and Puck's and Saturday Evening Post, they are jockeying for the stangle-hold on what remains of the skeletons of our basic inheritance.

Yours very truly,
ROBERT CANTWELL.

Butte, Mont.

---

## THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE IN BAPTIST BOARD FOREIGN MISSIONS

Dear Sir: Everybody is compelled to concede that Christ knew what he was talking about when he fixed the plan of salvation and directed how his gospel should be preached for that purpose.

He said for us to go and make disciples of all nations by preaching his gospel to them, baptize them in the name of the Trinity, then teach them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded.

We readily see that his proposition was to make Christians of them **first**, then teach them to observe the things he commanded.

To do work for Christ one has to be a Christian **first**, then he has to know by being taught what he must observe and teach to qualify him as an efficient worker.

The apostles were with Christ about three years for this purpose and he never turned them loose, nor left them until they were graduates in his teachings, so that they could teach others what he had faithfully taught them.

He had the same teachings for everybody and we have them perpetuated to us in the New Testament, to be perpetuated by us to others.

The order he established has been disregarded and trampled on to meet the demands of those who are using his teachings for purposes different to what he intended until they are resolved virtually into play things, without the saving effect they possess, and would exert if adhered to as he commanded.

Those who will not use them as he said, have no right to use them at all, because using them contrary thereto amounts to no using, with the trouble, expense, and harm necessarily following.

Our Baptist Foreign Mission Board says teach literary schools FIRST as a means to the end in making disciples of the nations: Christ said teach them to make them Christians, and qualify them for Christian work.

Common sense teaches that there is no saving power in a school book, if so, to what extent does it exist in connection with the Bible?

The fact that our Baptist Boards practice it makes it incumbent on them to show us that we may know to what extent the Bible is deficient for the purpose and in what place, or places, and they should come across straight.

People don't have to be educated to make them Christians; if so the ignorant are gone without hope.

The word First is used directly at least seventy-five times in the Bible, which shows its pre-eminencne above all other books in matters sof religion.

Education is one thing and Christianity another.

Christ said render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

If it is incumbent on Southern Baptist to educate one Chink to make him a Christian, then it is incumbent on them to educate the whole bunch; and Japan with her 40,000,000 and China with her 400,000,000 would give them a dose that would wake up their financial stomachs.

When we want a school house and a school teacher in a community we do not appeal to our local Baptist Churches for the money.

Our Baptist people would kick like Texas ponies on such a proposition, that being for the government of Caesar.

That accounts for the fact that our Baptist Boards won't tell them that the money collected from them in the name of missions goes for education in the Orient.

The statistics in the minutes of the 1914 session of The Southern Baptist Convention show only 380 so-called Churches on the foreign field after a so-called mission work of seventy years, 1845 being the time it was commenced, and only thirteen of them conceded to be self-supporting, which is doubted, as our Baptist Boards appear to want to make the best showing possible by shielding the real facts from our Baptist people.

Brother Watson, you are having the world, the flesh, and the devil to contend with, but I feel their match for the fight that is on is met in you to an extent that you will always stay on the top side.

It does me good far beyond my power to express to see you fan out so successfully, every one who jumps on you.

You are growing stronger each day in the minds of the people.

Very truly yours,

S. W. WHITMAN.

Alabama.

---

## JACKSONVILLE GROWING ENTHUSIASTIC.

Dear Sir: No doubt you know about the big patriotic work going on now in Jacksonville, Fla. Mr. Wm. Parker, of Pennsylvania, is with us, and working as only he, can. He delivered two impressive and beautiful lectures every night last week—women at one church, and men at another—this week he will lecture to them all together. He is getting many members into the National Organization. Yesterday, the Snyder Memorial Church, and Sunday School room were packed, while many had to go away for lack of room.

While he was telling them about the Pope of Rome—how he could wander about in his beautiful vatican of eleven thousand rooms for just one old bachelor—how he could fix his gaze in the differennt directions and behold the Rome ruled, and ruined countries, and realize that sooner or later he will have to flee or reap the just reward of his own wicked works—and that if he were in his place, he would either go to England, or come to the United States, as they are the only countries left to him, where the people are still asleep, and even they are waking up; that in the United States we have Tom Watson; The Jeffersonian; The American Citizen, and the Menace. When he said "Tom Watson" I wish you could have heard the applause, it would have done your heart good, (my own fingers ached) I did not know before how the people of Jacksonville, appreciated you—but I guess it is sort of like it was with Mr. Martin, pastor of that church—he has been making a strong fight along those lines for years, and has not had the support that he should have had from the people; he had a hard time to get his church for Mr. Parker, because some of his stewards did not approve—even after the Masons had shut him out of the Moroco Temple, after they had been paid for use of same, as they do in so many other places—one would think they were "Knights of Columbus" rather than Masons; but finally

he got his church opened up to him as many of the other churches had, and when Mr. Parker, said that he would guarantee that Mr. Martin, had more good substantial friends now, than he had in the city before, there was another great outburst. You see as soon as Mr. Parker, can get their eyes sort of pried open, and they begin to see "men as trees walking" so to speak, they recognize Tom Watson—Rev. Mr. Martin—Col. Ralph K. Roberts, and many other good patriotic men and women, in the front ranks, and say, "Why this is what they have been telling us about all this time."

I never read The Jeffersonian until recently; I had always heard you spoken of as being cranky, and all such talk, but when I had read your paper once, I immediately subscribed for it, and ordered your book on "Foreign Missions."

Well, if any one thinks that you are any of the things that some of them call you, all they have to do, is to read what you write. They will find as I did, that you are not only one of the most sane, but one of the best informed men alive. And may the Lord keep you strong in the lead, for God, Home, and Liberty of the United States, from the controling influence of the Roman Catholic Church.

Yours in the great work,
MRS. L. A. HERNDONE.

---

### WE KNOW THESE THINGS.

Dear Sir: The writer began life as a business man in South Georgia a quarter of a century ago. Then the politics in most of these sparsely settled counties were controlled by family connections. The country was settled up by a few families years ago, and as the family interests of each was pretty large, it was a matter as to which family controlled politics, and all other issues were cast aside.

Today those conditions exist no longer. The heavy influx of people from the different counties of this state and from other states, has brought about changes which no longer leaves the old settlers in control of politics. These days when the election comes off, in many of these south Georgia counties, instead of holding an election, a sale is pulled off, and the highest bidder gets the office. How long this government can exist, if conditions in other sections are as bad as they are in South Georgia, I will let the reader answer.

In the days of Populism, I was an organized democrat, and I am still a democrat, yet Mr. Watson, I realize that every charge you bring against the politicians and the political parties of today, to be true.

But what can you, or anybody else do to relieve conditions, when men who own their own homes, will go to the polls and sell their vote to the highest bidder? I have seen as many as twenty voters pool their strength and offer their votes for sale to the highest bidder, and, among those voters, were men whom the people looked upon as some of the most successful men in the community. They did not sell their vote to the highest bidder, because they needed the money, but they would say that this was the only way they could get anything out of voting, as one man would do as much good as another, that any man they elected would do what the money power demanded of them, that every man they had ever elected had gone back on their promises, and there was no confidence to be placed in any of them.

Mr. Watson, such is the conditions as you or anyone else will find them if you will only go out among the country people and look the facts up and be sincere in looking for them.

It is disgraceful for me to state it, but the negroes were never any worse about selling their votes than many of the white people are today, and the most unfortunate thing is that, these people sell their votes because they have lost confidence in all candidates and look upon one as being as honest as the other, and don't expect any of them to do them any good, but expect all to go with the money power, hence, when the voter gets the chance to get money for his vote, he looks upon it as the proper thing to do in order to get his share of the money as it goes the rounds. These are facts and honest people may doubt them and think that I am overstating the facts, but my dear reader, if you are blind to these conditions it is time you were opening your eyes, and especially keep them open on salesday, formerly called election day.

The writer has known one man and his family connections to spend $1,000 to get elected to a county office. He has known one individual to spend of his own money $3,000 to aid in electing a friend to Congress, and he named the postmaster, of his own town. I don't know how much more he spent than the $3,000, but I know he spent that much; had to carry his county you know in order to name the postmaster, then too, there were some other considerations not necessary to name here.

How do men who own no property, and pay only a poll tax manage to spend thousands of dollars upon their campaigns for offices in the national capital? If they haven't got the money of their own, don't common sense tell us that, "those friends" who put up the money for them, expect a return of it in some form? Has any man in Georgia friends sufficient in number to plank down enough money to pay the expenses necessary to carry on a state-wide campaign for the Senate of the United States unless they expect returns for it? Yet men have been elected to the United

# Weavers of Speech

Upon the magic looms of the Bell System, tens of millions of telephone messages are daily woven into a marvelous fabric, representing the countless activities of a busy people.

Day and night, invisible hands shift the shuttles to and fro, weaving the thoughts of men and women into a pattern which, if it could be seen as a tapestry, would tell a dramatic story of our business and social life.

In its warp and woof would mingle success and failure, triumph and tragedy, joy and sorrow, sentiment and shop-talk, heart emotions and million-dollar deals.

The weavers are the 70,000 Bell operators. Out of sight of the subscribers, these weavers of speech sit silently at the switchboards, swiftly and skillfully interlacing the cords which guide the human voice over the country in all directions.

Whether a man wants his neighbor in town, or some one in a far-away state; whether the calls come one or ten a minute, the work of the operators is ever the same—making direct, instant communication everywhere possible.

This is Bell Service. Not only is it necessary to provide the facilities for the weaving of speech, but these facilities must be vitalized with the skill and intelligence which, in the Bell System, have made Universal Service the privilege of the millions.

AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY
AND ASSOCIATED COMPANIES

*One Policy* *One System* *Universal Service*

States Senate and spent thousands of dollars during their campaign, who by their sworn tax returns did not have a dollar's worth of taxable property, and yet, the people wonder why they don't get relief from the laws passed in Congress. They send men to Washington whose body and soul are mortgaged to the interest against them, before they are elected.

But this letter is already too long. If it escapes the waste basket, I hope that it will cause some of our people to think and do as I have done, admit that you are right, Mr. Watson, and in the future throw down their former prejudices to you, and help to hold up your hands, for I am frank to admit that, in all my talks with different people, even your enemies give you credit for being sincere and many of them admit that you are right but that you should do your work "inside the party." When will the people learn that the "parties" are all one and the same—money!

How in the name of Heaven this money power is to be smashed, is something I don't know how to answer, so long as voters are willing to sell out to it, and also ready to crucify anyone who attempts to destroy it.

T. W. V.

---

Dear Sir: I am a Georgian by birth and have been here in Florida very nearly eight years practicing medicine.

Since July I have been receiving and reading regularly The Jeffersonian Weekly and the August and September issues of your magazine.

As a subscriber to your periodicals I wish to express to you personally my admiration, regard and respect for you personally for doing as none other dared to do, at a time when Georgia judges, juries, her courts and her women were all being libelously slandered for trying to meet out a just punishment to one of the greatest of all guilty criminals this country has ever known.

You alone gloriously defended that grand old state and before God, you did so rightfully, fearlessly, honorably and undisputedly and have heaped upon your own head all the animosity evil-heartedness and revengful feelings that all such as for our cause and another condoned the work of Jew-money and the traitorous betrayal of the trust of the people by one whom the state had honored with the highest gift within her power.

Mr. Watson, I can't believe that the Great God who notes the sparrows fall will allow one who stands for the grand and glorious advocated principles of righteousness which you hearlded each week to the people, to be crushed into silence by the enemies of truth and justice and there to remain forever. I can't believe it!

May God direct an escape for the righteous! May He provide an able and ample advocate for you! For well do I know that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

May God touch your tongue with a live coal from off the altar of righteousness in the day of your trial and temptation.

I graduated in Augusta, Ga., and I intended being there the day of your arraignment but fear I can't get off this time. With very best wishes for you, I am,

W. B. GODARD.

---

### AN ALABAMA LADY WRITES OF THE AGE-LIMIT AND IMMORAL CONDITIONS WHICH SURROUND THE EMPLOYMENT OF POOR GIRLS.

Dear Sir: I enjoy your paper and magazine immensely. But about the bad girls and boys: If a child between 10 and 11 years old is basely deceived by a man over 18, then it is a heinous crime. If the man is over 20 he is worse than a fiend for she is a child. He tells her a hundred lies.

Women have told me with tears streaming from their faces who had been wellbred of fine blood that the man was the cause 99 times in every 100. In the cities of Columbus, Atlanta, and the South men make a child love them,—and lie, God makes no differences in bad men and women.

Why do Southern people kick their own girl out to commit suicide, and say they don't blame the man? My God, that's the reason men laugh and keep up their drinking, gambling, cursing, lying. But very little is said about it. But if the child lives a hundred years she is never happy any more, seldom weds, men think she is not fit. When nearly always she is a sweet christian afterwards and he goes on the same.

According to God's word its a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God. The man is going to hell who murders a child; women commiting suicide more than ever; women don't tell much. They say that the same old tale would be told on them if they did, that they were all to blame. Insulted by men because they are begging for work. No work no home, even innocent women are. So there are hundreds more Leo Franks; women swear there are. Why not forgive girls and lift them and punish boys instead of upholding them as people do, and thereby encouraging boys to go as usual?

Thank God for what you say about hospitals. My sister has been a partial invalid for fifteen years. Free hospitals would have put her on her feet to see after her little children.

But Atlanta Wesley Memorial would do nothing. My sister is a Methodist and millions are being sent to help build hospitals over there.

A boy bent double here with Rheuma-

tism; no hospital; no money. Fallen girls kicked out, run over as filth. I am an orphan. Men are always ready to help strong men, as they see a chance of getting money back. I have suffered to drive me insane on account of none lending a helping hand while I was in great distress. Christians are scattering as hen's teeth. I have tested or God tested three hundred girls. Their faith in nearly every case are "me and mine." "Go and be fed." You and your wife's photos adorn our mantel. God bless you and yours. We love you; Listen; an insulter said you would not publish my letter, said it was not the truth. I am sending you fifty cents. would send fifty dollars; no pay scarcely.

Men pay girls $5.00 per week and send $2.00 to foreign fields. Tell it over and over. Rich men insult girls because they know they can't live in city on $5.00. If a woman kills such a man she has merely put him out from dragging sweet innocent girls down gradually. Men and women uphold men in these things. I am a primitive Baptist. I see plainly we need half-free infirmaries here. Need girls paid $8.00. Listen, White slavers lock girls behind high fences, the girls fight and scream and pray she knew nothing about these things. People say everywhere women are to blame. Mary Phagan was proof that a million more was not to blame. I pray all the time, do the very best I can; I do whatever my hands find, and yet those whom I have labored and suffered for tell falsehoods on me and will not help me bear my burdens; just like they do you. So you see its persecution and must come to refine the gold and burn the dross, which is suffering. Plead for half-charity hospitals, for girls better salaries; to let foreign missions go. God can save or raise up preachers over there. They are already saved in His mind and purpose.

A man I loved and respected insulted me because I was very poor, and he misunderstood something I said. He said no man said anything to a girl unless she was entirely to blame. It is a lie. I was shocked and it made me sick at heart. It nearly killed me. I swear there are more Leo Franks; thousands. Women tell women I will love him always, so you see these things they say are crimes and you will know this is the truth when we stand before the judgment bar of God.

I want to send a club of subs. soon. I believe Catholicism will bring war. Fight on; pray on; but don't grieve so, it has killed me to grieve 22 years. It don't do any good. Pray for hospitals; more Christianity; less foreign work; for white-slavers down-fall. I see partial invalids everywhere I could help and heal had I the means. God bless you.

Lanett, La. MISS MINNIE WELDON.

# Book Reviews.

## THE VATICAN AND THE WAR.

(Dr. Percy Y. Magan.)

A beautifully printed and illustrated booklet, giving a "bird's-eye view" of the historical back-ground, the immediate causes and the present tendencies of the Armageddon.

The author bases himself on Holy Writ —especially Revelations—and gives an orthodox presentation of his case.

In a way, he suggests not by words but by necessary inference—that the present alliance between the Pope, the German emperors and the Infidels of Turkey, is a resumption of **the war of the Papacy against the Reformation.**

Traced from the days when the very Council of Romanists which deposed Pope John XXIII. for being an adulterer, a murderer, a rapist, and a sodomist, **burnt John Huss and Jerome** for being anti-papal Catholics, the deadly antagonism between the Papacy and Progress has never really ceased to breed trouble.

The Papacy seeks to again reduce mankind to slavery, while mankind is determined to march on, despite the reactionary efforts of Popes, Kings, and aristocracies.

As this war goes on, that feature will be more and more prominent, namely—the effort of Peoples to resist the reactionary attempts of "Divine Right" humbugs and tyrants.

The author of the booklet is a Mason, and his work shows that he is not one of the 32 degree Los Angeles breed.

Published by the Southern Publishers Association, Nashville, Tenn.

*Strawberry PLANTS* **FREE** To introduce our *Pedigreed Everbearing* strawberries we will send 25 fine plants free. PEDIGREED NURSERY CO., SULLIVAN, MO.

$3.98 Only

READ OUR OFFER

33 Presents FREE if you remit Cash with order. SEND us $3.98 Special wholesale for One Box (50) of our Regular $80.00 per thousand CIGARS—ten Cent Sellers which we want INTRODUCED QUICK, Staple Brands, and we give in SAME PACKAGE this S. & W. Mod. 32 or 38 Cal., REVOLVER, Safety POLICE- any length barrel at no Extra price, also Genuine Stem wind Watch worth $3, together with 33 **Additional Presents Free** which we have not space to mention but consists of Knife, Scissors etc. if you send Cash with order. Will ship C. O.D. $3.93 by Express or Parcel Post but you only get the REVOLVER as PREMIUM. No Examination can be had by Parcel Post, but can be EXAMINED by EXPRESS. If offer is not as we say return goods and we return your money—That's all. Name Express office.

DIXIE CIGAR CO., Dep't 30 Jacksonville, Fla.

LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS. By Charles T. Sprading, Los Angeles.

The title indicates the scope of the work. It is an appreciation of those men and women who have given themselves—some wholly, and some partially—to the cause of human emancipation and advancement.

The first name on Mr. Sprading's list, is that of Edmund Burke, and his Essay on "Natural Society" is reproduced. The last name on the list is that of Maria Montessor; and the Essay of the illustrious Italian Professoress, on "Discipline" is given and a most broad-minded and inspiring Essay it is!

Between these two names came Paine, Jefferson, Godurn, Humboldt, Mill, Emerson, Garrison, Phillips, Warren, Thoreau, Spencer, Lincoln, Ingersoll, George, Tolstoy, Ferrer and some others.

The price of the book is $1.50, and the address of the author-publisher is 6829 Broad Street, Los Angeles, Cal.


## *What Were the "Dark Ages?"*

In history it was the period in which the Roman Catholic religion dominated the world.

## *What was the "Renaissance?"*

It was the period which practically began the revival learning.

***Would you like to know more of these two epochs in the history of the world?***

**Send TEN CENTS for a copy of**

**Watson's Magazine for September**

**JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY**
**Thomson, Ga.**

# Life and Times of Andrew Jackson

Embraces much valuable American history left out of the regular "Histories."

THIS VOLUME TELLS YOU ABOUT

THE INDIAN WARS IN THE SOUTH,
THE EARLY SETTLEMENTS, CUSTOMS, &C.,
THE SOUTHERN STATESMEN OF THE OLD ORDER,
THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS,
JACKSON'S GREAT FIGHT ON THE MONEY POWER,
CALHOUN'S MASTERLY CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE TARIFF ROBBERS,
PEGGY O'NEAL AND HER ROMANTIC EPISODE,
JACKSON'S FIGHTS, DUELS, QUARRELS, HORSE-RACES, &C.,
THE REMOVAL OF THE CREEKS AND THE CHEROKEES,
TEXAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE, &C., &C.

**PRICE: CLOTH, $1.50; BOARD, $1.00**

**THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY**
**THOMSON, GEORGIA**

# "THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FRANK CASE."

Read the Synopsis of

## THE SWORN EVIDENCE,

as it appears in

# THE OFFICIAL RECORD.

Carefully Condensed by Mr. Watson, and published in the

## SEPTEMBER NUMBER

of

## WATSON'S MAGAZINE.

This case is one of the celebrities and will be talked of for years to come.

**Buy a copy for present and future reference.**

**PRICE 10 CENTS.**

JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Thomson, Ga.

# A Book of Sketches

## By THOS. E. WATSON

**This new book covers a wide field of literary research**

**HISTORICAL BIOGRAPHICAL PERSONAL**

**Here is a list of the articles which make up the new book:**


| Contents | Page |
|---|---|
| Random Reminiscences of Toombs and Stephens | 1 |
| The Wise Man Solon and the Silly King Croesus | 27 |
| A Gross Insult to the Scotch | 38 |
| Robert Toombs: A Life Sketch; Some Anecdotes, and His Last Public Speech | 57 |
| The Glory That Was Greece | 83 |
| Edgar A. Poe | 101 |
| Wit and Humor | 105 |
| The Egyptian Sphinx and the Negro | 119 |
| The Passing of Lucy and Rollo | 160 |
| Concerning Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War | 166 |
| The Struggle of Church Against State in France | 185 |
| With Brisbane at Delmonico's | 196 |
| The Roman Catholic Hierarchy and Politics | 216 |
| The Oddities of the Great | 231 |
| Pages Lost from a Book | 237 |
| Tolstoy and the Land | 244 |
| The Stewardship | 250 |
| The Reign of the Technicality | 254 |
| Concerning Money | 260 |
| A Bitter Attack Upon the South | 267 |
| "Take the Children" | 279 |
| "Where Am I At?" | 287 |
| The Man and the Land | 290 |
| Is the Study of Latin and Greek Necessary to the Practical Lawyer? | 316 |
| As to Orators and Oratory | 324 |
| Socialism and One of Its Great Books | 327 |
| Common Sense Education | 343 |
| Some Aftermath of the Civil War (Stephens, Toombs, Ben Hill, the Ku Klux Klan, the Colquitt Campaign of 1880, Etc.) | 349 |
| Teasing a Single Taxer | 369 |
| Paper Money and John Law | 378 |
| The Dartmouth College Decision | 384 |
| Thos. E. Watson's Tribute to the Late Sam Jones on His Fiftieth Birthday | 390 |
| Our American Judicial Oligarchy | 398 |


**Beautifully Illustrated** **Paper Cover**

**Price, 75 Cents**

## The Jeffersonian Publishing Co.

**Thomson, - Georgia**

# Post Yourself on the Burning Issues of Today

*On the Creed of Thomas Jefferson.*
*On our National system of taxing Poverty instead of Wealth.*
*On the laws which rob the Many to enrich the Few — Laws made by traitor Congressmen.*
*On the National Banking System, which charters a Money Trust to rule and rob the American world and make Panics when it suits Wall Street.*
*On the Initiative, Referendum and Recall.*
*On the Rights of Organized Labor, historically reviewed and considered.*
*On the evils of our privately owned Transportation systems.*
*On Bimetalism and the New Slavery resulting from England's money system.*
*On Child Slavery in the United States.*
*On the Income Tax.*
*On the Negro Question—The great Race Danger.*
*On the true Brotherhood of Man.*
*On the Remedies for our national economic and political troubles.*

READ

## Watson's Life and Speeches

*A book of 300 pages* *Price 50 cents.*

*Jeffersonian Pub. Co., Thomson, Ga*

# A Thorough Study of Foreign Missions

This is a most important subject. It involves questions of statesmanship, as well as religion.

*The Roman Catholics are encouraging Protestants to concentrate their attention on foreign countries, while the Romanists are concentrating on the United States.*

The Protestants are walking right into the trap.

Mr. Watson is appealing to Protestant churches to save America from the wolves of Rome.

His book contains 158 pages.

It is beautifully printed, on excellent paper.

It is profusely illustrated.

The price is 30 cents. We send it post-paid.

Address

**THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING CO.**

THOMSON, GEORGIA

# LIFE AND TIMES

OF

# ANDREW JACKSON

## Illustrated Beautifully Printed

CLOTH, $1.50; PAPER, $1.00, POSTPAID

Supersedes all other biographies of Old Hickory, because it uses material not accessible to any other biographer.

Mr. Watson collected a mass of original documents and data that Parton, Colyar, Sumner, Brown and others had not discovered.

For two years, Mr. Watson labored in getting together his authorities.

This large book treats of—

*The Indian Wars.*
*The War of 1812 and the Battle of New Orleans.*
*Jackson's Personal Feuds and Fights.*
*The Aaron Burr Episode.*
*The Quarrel of Jackson, Crawford and Calhoun.*
*The Famous War on the Bank.*
*The Tariff Struggle, and South Carolina's Victory.*
*The Peggy O'Neal Episode.*

All the historic celebrities pass in review—Clay, Webster, Calhoun, John Randolph, Benton, Adams, Crawford, Van Buren, Sam Houston, Gen. Coffee, Davy Crockett, Gen. Sam Dale, John Sevier, etc.

In no other one book can be found the riches of information about American history that are contained in this.

## THE JEFFERSONIAN PUB. CO.

THOMSON, = GEORGIA

# A BOOK ALL YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULD READ

You have heard so much about Cæsar—wouldn't you like a brief, up-to-date sketch of his marvelous career, his creation of the Roman Empire, his murder and his great funeral? . . . . . .

Wouldn't you like to know about the noble pair of brothers, the Gracchii? . . . . . .

And about Marius and Sylla? And about the great insurrection of white slaves led by Spartacus? . .

Also the immortal love-story of Antony and Cleopatra? All this and much more you will find in . . .

## WATSON'S "ROMAN SKETCHES"

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, Thomson, Ga.

---

## *The Cream of Mr. Watson's Miscellaneous Writings Covering a Period of 30 Years*

*ALTOGETHER APART FROM HIS POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND HISTORICAL WORK.*

They reflect the rare, occasional mood of the man of ideals, of hopes and dreams, of love and sorrow, of solitary reflection, and of glimpses of the inner self. We call the volume

# PROSE MISCELLANIES

We have a beautifully printed and illustrated edition bound in board covers, and the book is typographically as pretty as new shoes.

PRICE **$1.00,** POSTPAID

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, Thomson, Ga.

## THIS SERIES OF PAMPHLETS

By Thos. E. Watson.

*Oath of 4th Degree Knights of Columbus.*
*Is there a Roman (Catholic) Peril?*
*The Inevitable Crimes of Celibacy.*
*What Goes on in the Nunneries?*

*The Italian Pope's Campaign Against the Constitutional Rights of American Citizens.*

**For 35c Postpaid.**

After reading this series of pamphlets, a clear, concise, understanding will be had of the effort to

**MAKE AMERICA CATHOLIC**

and of the disastrous results that will follow.

***THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING CO., Thomson, Ga.***

# THE HOUSE OF HAPSBURG

**BY THOS. E. WATSON**

The Latest of Mr. Watson's Historical Works
States Cause of Present European War

Shows the Origin of the Present House of Hapsburg; the Growth of the Papal Power of Rome.

John Huss, John Wycliffe, Martin Luther, the Thirty Years War and the Reformation.

**ILLUSTRATED---96 PAGES.**

***Stiff Paper Cover; Well Printed; Good Type.***

**50 Cents Postpaid.**

**JEFFERSONIAN PUB. CO.**

# A Book About the Socialists and About Socialism

In this work, Mr. Watson takes up, one by one, each of the propositions of Karl Marx, and discusses them fully and fairly.

He also analyses the great book of Herr Bebel, the world-leader of Socialism, "Woman Under Socialism."

Mr. Watson cites standard historical works to prove that Bebel, Marx and other Socialist leaders are altogether wrong about,

*The Origin of Property,*
*The rise of the Marital relation,*
*The Cause of the inequality of Wealth, etc.*

Mr. Watson demonstrates that Socialism—as taught by Marx, Bebel, LaSalle, Engel, etc.—would annihilate

*Individuality and personal liberty,*
*Home-life, as we now know it,*
*The White Man's Supremacy over the inferior races,*
*The Marital relation, with its protection to women,* and finally
*RELIGION OF ALL KINDS.*

Mr. Watson proves that SPECIAL PRIVILEGE, intrenched in law and in government, is now, and always has been, *the Great Enemy of the Human race.*

PRICE, 25 CENTS

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY

THOMSON, GA

# Life and Times

OF

# Thomas Jefferson

ILLUSTRATED

Paper, .50

---

The author not only bought every published volume that bore upon Jefferson and his times, but he corresponded with various persons who were in possession of unpublished documents, letters, anecdotes, traditions, etc.

He went to Virginia and conversed with members of the Jefferson family and with old men who had known Mr. Jefferson.

All the histories, biographies, memoirs, Historical Collections of States, monographs on special episodes, State histories, etc., were ransacked and used.

Many of these are out of print, and copies are rarely found.

Therefore, Mr. Watson's work is INDISPENSABLE to all those who want to know the whole truth about Jefferson, and about the Great Men and the Great Events of that period of our history.

The volume contains a large amount of Southern history, slighted by Northern historians.

---

## Jeffersonian Publishing Company

Thomson, - Georgia

# BETHANY
(ILLUSTRATED)

# WATERLOO

By THOS. E. WATSON

*Two Stories Dealing With War Periods of Vastly Different Phases of Interest.*

"BETHANY". Story of the Old South, Life on the Ante-bellum Plantation, Causes of the War, Soldier Life in the Confederate Army. Mr. Watson's uncle is the hero of the story, and the home-life pictured, was that of the Watson family. Illustrated from photographs. New Edition. Cloth bound . . . . . **$1.00**

"WATERLOO" is a classic. It gives the final chapters in the turbulent life of "The Little Corporal." "The Man of Destiny," who as the author, Thos. E. Watson, says of him, in "Waterloo": "Full of error, yet full of virtue; pure gold at one crisis, mere dross at another; superbly great on some occasions, and pitiably weak on others." Beautifully bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, . . . . . **$1.00**

*These Books will make ideal Gifts, and will be a welcome addition to the library of the discriminating reader*

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
THOMSON, GEORGIA

THE

# WEEKLY JEFFERSONIAN

THOS. E. WATSON, Editor

One Dollar a Year
In Clubs of Ten, Fifty Cents

Send For Sample Copy

A Magnificent Advertising Medium

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
THOMSON, GEORGIA

# WATSON'S MAGAZINE

THOS. E. WATSON, Editor

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

In Clubs of TEN, Money Accompanying Order, Per Year, Each, 50 Cents

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
THOMSON, GA.

NEW EDITION

OF

# NAPOLEON

By THOS. E. WATSON

Sold in France as the Best One-Volume Life of the Emperor, and Regarded as a Standard, by Eminent Scholars

Bound in Cloth,
Illustrated, Best Paper
and Typographical Appearance

LIMITED EDITION

PRICE $1.50
POSTPAID

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
THOMSON, GEORGIA